

(coll M.S. V.1 #1-4) SC

THE CLASSICAL QUARTERLY

NEW SERIES VOLUME I NUMBERS 3, 4

(Vol. XLIV of the continuous series)

July—October 1951

PROPERTY OF
PRINCETON UNIVERSITY
LIBRARY

NOV 12 1951

RECEIVED

OXFORD : AT THE CLARENDON PRESS

LONDON NEW YORK TORONTO MELBOURNE

GEOFFREY CUMBERLEGE : OXFORD UNIVERSITY PRESS

Price for single numbers, 5s. 6d. net (5s. 8d. post free); for double numbers, 11s. net (11s. 4d. post free). Yearly subscription, 18s. post free. Combined yearly subscription for THE CLASSICAL QUARTERLY and THE CLASSICAL REVIEW, 30s. post free.

THE CLASSICAL QUARTERLY

Editors Professor D. L. PAGE, M.A., Trinity College, Cambridge
G. T. GRIFFITH, M.A., Gonville and Caius College, Cambridge

BOARD OF MANAGEMENT

Professor E. H. Warmington, M.A. (Chairman)	}	Representing the Council of the Classical Association
Professor R. G. Austin, M.A. (Hon. Treas.)		
F. H. Sandbach, M.A.		
Professor F. W. Walbank, M.A.		
W. S. Watt, M.A.		
N. G. L. Hammond, M.A., representing the Cambridge Philological Society		
M. Platnauer, B.LITT., M.A., representing the Oxford Philological Society		

With the co-operation of

Professor B. D. Meritt, Institute for Advanced Study, Princeton,
Professor J. A. Fitzherbert, University of Adelaide, and
Professor Homer A. Thompson, Institute for Advanced Study, Princeton

CONTENTS

Nicandrea: With Reference to Liddell and Scott	A. S. F. GOW	95
The Metrical Units of Greek Lyric Verse. III	A. M. DALE	119
The Interpretation of <i>Res Gestae Divi Augusti</i> , 34. 1	F. E. ADCOCK	130
On the Cruces of Horace, <i>Satires</i> 2. 2	A. Y. CAMPBELL	136
The Local Ablative in Statius	R. D. WILLIAMS	143
Polyclitus and Pythagoreanism	J. E. RAVEN	147
Elephant Tactics: Amm. Marc. 25. 1. 14; Sil. 9. 581-3; Lucr. 2. 537-9	E. L. B. MEURIG DAVIES	153
Note on the Nova Hellenicorum Oxyrhynchiorum Fragmenta	ALEXANDER FUKS	155
Periplus Maris Erythraei	J. A. B. PALMER	156
The Thesis in the Roman Rhetorical Schools of the Republic	M. L. CLARKE	159
Two Notes on the Text of Aristophanes	M. PLATNAUER	167
The Law of Libel at Rome	R. E. SMITH	169

5
9
0
6
3
7
3
5
6
9
7
9

T
w
C

M
an
T

IMPORTANT NOTICE

THE Publisher regrets that owing to recent rises in production costs it will be necessary to increase the prices of the *Classical Quarterly* and *Classical Review* as follows:

CLASSICAL QUARTERLY	Subscription 24s., post free. Single number 6s. 6d. net.
---------------------	---

CLASSICAL REVIEW	Subscription 21s. 6d., post free. Double number 14s. 6d. net.
------------------	--

Combined subscription 40s., post free.

Members of the Classical Association will receive the *Quarterly* at 20s. and the *Review* at 18s., or together at 35s.

The increased prices are applicable to orders for the 1952 and subsequent issues.

SOME
summ
balist
of me
and t
him,
atten
throu
need
poem

On
the n
often
tione
the h
visibl
Th. 8
says
the N
the as
interp
and w

Be
a *σοφ*
Latin
text o
J. G.
by M.
zeitun
inclina
critica
author
The p
full co
there

Be
necess
only t

¹ See

² I v
propos

³ Ot
which

I have

⁴ Th
will not

NICANDREA

WITH REFERENCE TO LIDDELL AND SCOTT, ed. 9

SOME day, it may be, a better Greek scholar and more skilful emendator than I will summon to his aid from among scientists familiar with the Levant a botanist, a herpetologist, and an entomologist, empanel for consultations a small body of medical men who have practised in the Near East, and produce an annotated text and translation of Nicander; and when this has been done it will be possible to read him, not indeed with pleasure, but with a good deal less labour and vexation than attend the process at present. Meanwhile, those whose duty obliges them to struggle through the *Theriaca* and *Alexipharmaca* with the aids now available stand in no need of the injunction not to forget him which the author has appended to those two poems.

Of the aids known to me much the most important are the scholia, which contain the names of various reputable scholars, embody much genuine erudition,¹ and are often the sole clue not only to the identity of plants, creatures, and substances mentioned in the poems but also to the meanings of very many words unknown outside the hispid vocabulary of the poet. Unfortunately however the scholiasts are often visibly guessing, and their guesses are sometimes visibly ridiculous. For instance, *Th.* 849 ἀθεραΐδα] τὴν θερμὴν, ἢ τὴν ἔχουσαν ἀθέρας, ἢ ψυχράν. Again, the ichneumon, says N. (*Th.* 195), resembles a marten, and before doing battle with an asp dives into the Nile and smears itself with mud, which dries on its fur and armours it against the asp's teeth; ἰχνεύμων] εἶδος ἀστροῦ remarks the scholiast.² It follows therefore that interpretations derived solely from the scholia may be mere guesses and wildly wrong, and where they seem so they may be rejected without compunction.

Besides the scholia there are Greek paraphrases of the two poems by Eutecnius, a σοφιστής of unknown date who performed the like service for Oppian, a version in Latin hexameters by J. Gorraeus first printed in 1557³ and reprinted with K. Lehrs's text of 1843 in the Didot *Poetae Bucolici et Didactici*, Latin paraphrases provided by J. G. Schneider in his editions of *Al.* (1792) and *Th.* (1816), and a German translation by M. Brenning safely interred as a feuilleton in the *Allgemeine medizinische Centralzeitung* for 1904. All these share with Eutecnius, and even with the scholia, a marked inclination to evade difficulties of detail. J. G. Schneider's editions contain notes both critical and exegetical, but the latter, though industrious in collecting ancient authorities on the subjects treated by N., do not often help one to construe the text. The preface and critical apparatus of O. Schneider, whose *Nicandrea* of 1856 provided full collations of the manuscripts,⁴ occasionally offer a valuable comment. And finally there are the lexica.

Being concerned with another Alexandrian poet, I considered it some years ago necessary to acquaint myself with the general contents of N.'s poems, and one has only to wrestle with a few lines to discover that he is most negligently handled in

¹ See Wilamowitz *Herakles* 1. 189.

² I will not conceal the fact that F. E. Kind proposed (*Herm.* xlv. 624) to read κάρου.

³ Other sixteenth-century Latin versions, of which there are several, are less accessible and I have not pursued them.

⁴ The party envisaged in my first paragraph will now have to take into account *P. Oxy.* 2221,

a papyrus of the first century A.D. which contains a fragmentary commentary on *Th.* 377-95 and in the lemmata substantial fragments of the lines interpreted. Its agreements with MSS. of the common class against Paris. suppl. 247 (*IT*) attest at least the antiquity of the variants, and it presents a problem of its own in 391 f.

Liddell & Scott, ed. 9. I then made a good many corrections and additions in the margins of my Lexicon, and the stones there proffered me for bread having engendered an appetite which anyone is at liberty to consider morbid, I have since returned to the author and have read him with more attention to detail than my original purpose called for, aided on this occasion by the first draft of a translation on which my friend Mr. A. F. Scholfield had been working independently. The result has been a large increase in my marginalia, some new interpretations, and a few emendations, and it seemed worth while to collect them here in the hope that even if they do not materially lighten the labour of N.'s next reader, they may be useful to the next reviser of the Lexicon.

Before I set them out however, I must disclaim any competence to deal with the scientific questions involved, and it is with hesitation that I have touched on one or two below. On this subject however I have two general observations to make. One is that the botanist will often have unnecessary difficulty in discovering the grounds for the confident identifications presented to him. For instance, ἀτάλινμος, βούπλευρος, κουλυβάτεια, and νῆρις are mentioned as simples, and nothing in N. or his scholia explains how we may recognize them. The clues to the first three come, I think, from Eutecnius, Pliny, and Hesychius respectively; it is probably my ignorance of the subject which has concealed from me why νῆρις should '=*βράθυ*', but it is unfortunately not necessary to go beyond the text of N. himself to discover that some of the identifications are worse than uncertain.¹ The second observation is that some of them accord but ill with what N. says of the object. For instance *Th.* 811 οἷδά γε μὴν καὶ ἱούλος ἃ μῆδεται, 815 βροτοῖς ἐπὶ λοιγὸν ἀγούσαν | μυγαλήν. 'Ιούλος, we are told, is a creature like the centipede, prob. the wood-louse, and μυγαλή shrew-mouse, field-mouse; but whatever the superstitious may fear, who has been savaged by a shrew or menaced by the machinations of a wood-louse?² The scientific committee will have to consider how far what N. says of plants and creatures need be taken into consideration when attempting an identification. Perhaps not very much, but if so their task is noticeably complicated.

With this preface I proceed to record my addenda and corrigenda, which I have arranged in two alphabetical lists. In the first are included, together with some interpretations of my own, omissions and mistakes³ which impede the reader of N. In the second mainly, and much more briefly, omissions in articles which contain the information required but by omitting the references to N. give an incomplete or misleading account of the word in question. In a third section I have added some notes and interpretations in which the Lexicon is not concerned.

In what follows inverted commas indicate quotations from Liddell & Scott, ed. 9,

¹ See I below, s.vv. ἀνάρρινον, γογγύλος, δαυχμος, παιδέρως. These are all novelties in ed. 9, and I fear that the editor's hopes for his botanical revision (*Pref.*, p. vii) were too sanguine. Thiselton-Dyer, on whom he had laid his cares, wrote (*J. Phil.* xxxiii. 204) 'little has been done to explain the mass of plant names in Nicander. Meanwhile they have drifted into lexicons merely with meanings which tell nothing'.

² Dr. Johnson on the Shrewmouse: 'A mouse of which the bite is generally supposed venomous, and to which vulgar tradition assigns such malignity, that she is said to lame the foot over which she runs. I am informed that all these reports are calumnious, and that her feet and

teeth are equally harmless with those of any other little mouse.' Pliny (*N.H.* 8. 227, 29. 88) and some others (e.g. [Diosc.] *Ther.* 8, Philum. 33) regard them with disfavour; Aristotle (*H.A.* 604^b19) says merely that their bites may cause blisters in draught animals. So far as I am aware the reputation of the wood-louse is untarnished by such slanders.

³ I have every sympathy with those who make mistakes in N., having probably made a good number myself. Since however some of those in the Lexicon are very gross, I think it right to say that the majority of these are inherited from ed. 8, beyond which I have not thought it necessary to inquire.

except
substit
for the
omitted

P
edited
ἀβ
afflicts
poison

ἀγ
much
Al. 60

+
+
αἰ

ἀδρῆ
record
quotat

ἀραχνη
ποιήεν
καθεφ

Πετρή
χαμηλ
elsew

to de
in Fr.

I
includ
ἀδρῆ
prefer

at Th
the fe

+
αἰ
+

ἀκ
+

δλ
must

+
water
δέμας

poison
into a
ill-sup

ἀλ
and a

I
printe
S
F
see K

except that where quoting I have, in view of possible confusion with the two Schneiders, substituted Σ for 'sch(olia)', and I have omitted 'Nic.' from the references. L. stands for the Lexicon, JGSch. and OSch. for the Schneiders; an asterisk marks words omitted altogether from L.; + indicates that an existing entry requires an addition.

p. xxx Nicander. 'Scholia vetera ed. H. Bianchi, *Stud. Ital.* xii (1904).' Bianchi edited the scholia to the *Alexipharmaca* only.¹

ἀβλεμής, *Al.* 82 ineffective rather than 'feeble'. N. is talking of a retching which afflicts sufferers from white-lead poisoning but does not result in their voiding the poison.

ἀγρίοις, '2. maddening, ὀπώρα *Al.* 30'. That is one explanation in Σ, but another much more appropriate to the context is ἀγρία καὶ ὀρεωή, and that is the meaning at *Al.* 604, the only other example of the adj.

+ ἀελπής, unexpected (or perhaps hopeless), ἀελπία adv. *Al.* 125.

+ ἀητος, insatiable, *Th.* 783. (This article wants tidying up.)

ἀιδρήεις, 'εσσα, εν'. But there is no evidence for εσσα or εν, and at *Al.* 415 αἰδρήεντα, unless, as Σ assert, it is adverbial, agrees with νηδύν. L. is negligent in recording N.'s restriction of an adj. to two terminations. It mentions πολοίς, and its quotations disclose ἰοίς and μορόις so limited, but it is silent on ἀγρίοις *Al.* 604, ἀραχνήεις *Al.* 492, βρωμήεις *Al.* 486, δολοίς *Al.* 473, ἐρευθήεις *Th.* 899, νιφόις *Th.* 502, ποιήεις *Al.* 48; also on τρηχύς *Th.* 284, βλωθρός *Th.* 683, ἑδανός *Al.* 162 (see below s.v.), καθεφθός *Al.* 573, κεραός *Th.* 213, νέατος (*A.*) *Th.* 229, ὀλοός *Al.* 575, σμυγερός *Al.* 419. Περήεις *Al.* 390, and ὀσγινός *Th.* 870,² should, I think, be added, but at *Th.* 944 χαμηλήν | ἵππειον λειχῆνα the first adj. should probably be altered, for the noun is elsewhere masc. and might be expected to have that gender. At *Al.* 448 I leave others to determine whether κοίλιοι is fem. or δρυνός masc., and similarly αὐλῶνα βαθύν in *Fr.* 31.

I remark on this list (which is probably incomplete, and in any case does not include adj. cited as of two terminations from other authors) that in several besides αἰδρήεις the fem. form postulated in L. nowhere occurs; also that though the forms preferred by N. often serve a metrical convenience, they do not always do so, and that at *Th.* 120 (also unobserved by L.) he apparently wrote θαώτερος αἶσα though either the fem. form or the adverbial neut. would have served his purpose as well.³

+ αἰζήος, = ἄνθρωπος *Th.* 343; cf. 613.

αἰμόρροος is not 'subst.' in *Th.* 282; substitute therefore 321.

+ ἄκμητος, unharmed, prob. in *Th.* 820.

ἀκόνιτος, del. 'dub. l. in *Al.* 42', where it is only a dubious emendation.

+ ἀκτίς, day, ἐν μονήρει ἀκτίνι *Al.* 401. Cf. αὐγή below.

ἀλεξιάρη, del. 'wand that served as amulet'. Here at any rate (*Th.* 861) ῥάμος must be a medicament, despite OSch. and his proposed emendation in the next line.

+ ἀλθαίνω. *Al.* 112. In cases of white-lead poisoning administer an emetic in hot water ὅφρα τὰ μὲν τ' ἐρύγησι, τὰ δ' ἐψητοῖσι δαμασθεῖς | ἀλθήσῃ ὑδάτεσσιν ὅτ' ἰκμήνῃ δέμας ἰδρώς. I take this to mean in order that the patient may bring up some of the poison, and assimilate the remainder when, under the influence of the hot water, he breaks into a sweat—ἀλθαίνω, render harmless, make wholesome. The variant δαμάσσας, though ill-supported, is attractive.

ἄλλοτριόχρως in *A.P.* 11. 7 (= *Fr.* 107) certainly could not mean 'changing colour', and as it is merely an unhelpful conj. it had better disappear.⁴

¹ I cite Σ *Al.* hence, Σ *Th.* from H. Keil's text printed in OSch.'s edition.

² See s.v. ὀλοσχος below.

³ For earlier examples in comp. and sup. adj. see Kühner-Blass I. 554; add *Od.* 10. 279, 12. 11,

(probably), and Hes. *Th.* 408. For participles restricted to two terminations see *Th.* 180, 329, *Al.* 528.

⁴ But in the same epigram ξενοκυσθαπάτη (for -κυστ-) should be accepted.

ἀματροχία, 'by error for ἀματροχία'. So said Porphyry, who should be cited (*Qu. Hom.*, II. 23. 422), but could Callimachus and Nicander really not construe this Homeric line?

+ **ἀμολγός**, *milk-drinking*, *Th.* 49 (s.v.l.)—a line cited by L. s.v. ἀμορβός, the reading of the inferior MSS.

ἀμορβεύω, 'Med., let follow, make follow', *Th.* 349'. The words are ἀμορβεύοντο *λεπάργω* | δῶρα, and the verb means *committed to, had carried by* (διηκονοῦντο, ἐθεραπεύοντο, ἐφέροντο, Σ).

ἀμπελόεις. This word is acc. fem. pl. at *Al.* 266, ἀργήεις nom. fem. pl. at *Fr.* 74. 26, φαρμακόεις at *Al.* 293. L. records only the last.

+ **ἀμυδρός**, 'faint, weak', suitable at *Th.* 195, 358, 373, is less so at 158, where the asp, presently to be described as very large and dangerous, is called ἀμυδρότατον δάκος ἄλλων—probably *sluggish*, for the succeeding lines go on to say that it is lethargic until roused.

+ **ἀναβαθμός**, *slope, ascent*, prob. in *Th.* 283.

ἀνάγχω, del. 'hang up'. Even a cenchrines cannot do this to you.

+ **ἀνακρούω**. *Th.* 479 δοχμὸς ἀνακρούων θηρὸς πάτον. If you should have the misfortune to be pursued by a cenchrines you should not run straight but double this way and that so that the snake may rick its back in the attempt to follow you. The meaning is perhaps *baulk*.

+ **ἀναπνέω**, *rouse*, *Th.* 547.

ἀναπτύω, del. 'abs., sputter . . . *Al.* 211'. The object is *ξηρά*: cf. ἐπιπλύζω below.

ἀνάρρινον, 'prob. in *Fr.* 84'. The line is κάρδαμον ἀρρινόν τε μελάμφυλλον τε σύνηπυ, and Casaubon conjectured κάρδαμ' ἀνάρρινόν τε. If rightly therefore, ἀνάρρινον cannot ' = κάρδαμον': and if wrongly, ἀρρινον cannot ' = νᾶπυ ' unless νᾶπυ does not ' = σύναπι '.

ἄνθος (A) I. 2. After some pursuit we learn that ἄνθη χαλκοῦ at *Th.* 257 ' = χάλκανθον ' and means 'solution of blue vitriol (copper sulphate)', and that ἄνθος χαλκοῦ means 'particles thrown off by copper when cooling'. But there seems no reason to distinguish sing. and pl., nothing in the passage cited s.v. χάλκανθον necessarily implies a liquid, and Σ *Th.* 257 describe a solid. They assert that its colour is *πελιδνόν τε καὶ μάλλον ἔχον ἔγκριρον τὴν πελιδνότητα*, but N., who says that the skin of one bitten by an echidna is now *ἡερόεσσα*, now like lead, now like ἄνθη χαλκοῦ, probably means either blue, like crystals of copper sulphate, which is thrown off when copper sulphide ore is roasted;¹ or else green, like verdigris, which is perhaps what he means by χαλκοῖο πάλαι μεμογηότος ἄνθη prescribed at *Al.* 529.

* **ἀνικμαίνω**, = -άζω prob. in *Al.* 524.

ἀνόστεος, 'shell-less, of eggs', *Al.* 296'. But this meaning, though hardly in doubt, is somewhat surprising, and I am inclined to import Σ's ἀνόστρακα to the text.

* **ἀνυλήεις**. *Th.* 26 ἡ καὶ ἀνυλήεντα παρέκ λόφον, ἡ ἐνὶ βήσσης | ἔσχατιῇ. II has ἀν' ὑδρίεντα with ἀνυλήεντα as a v.l., the other MSS. ἀν' ὑλήεντα, and OSch. printed ἀν' ὑδρήεντα. But *unwooded*² provides a suitable contrast with βήσσα, and παρέκ, which is a preposition in 29, is here hard to construe as an adv.

ἄραδος, del. 'palpitation of the heart'.

+ **ἀργεννός**. Ἀβρότονον, says N. (*Th.* 66), οὔρεσι θάλλει | ἀργεννὴν ὑπὸ πέζαν (or βήσσαν), and L. is silent, as also on Rhian. *fr.* 54 οὔρεος ἀργεννοῖο περὶ πτύχας. There was a promontory in Erythraea called Ἀργεννον (Strab. 14. 644), and probably chalk

¹ I learn from Dr. U. R. Evans that cupric oxide, which is black, and cuprous oxide, which is red, may be thrown off from copper plates when cooling; and if any victim of an echidna opts for one of these I shall not gainsay him. In the fragment of Numenius (quoted by Σ) which

N. is paraphrasing the words are *ἔχωρ εἶδος . . . χάλκη ἴσον*, and Σ understood *χ.* to be the plant.

² This meaning seems indicated by the context, but Mr. Scholfield points out to me that on the analogy of ἀνομβρήεις, *rainy* (*Al.* 288), *wooded* is possible.

will explain all three (cf. L. s.v. ἀργινέεις). Σ say unhelpfully ἐν ἀργεννόεσαι τόποις, and L. disdains to notice this variant of the adj.

ἄρπεξα (Th. 393, 647). The MSS. disagree on the aspirate, but agree on ὑπάρπεζος (284), which is against it.

ἄρρινον, see ἀνάρρινον above.

+ ἄσαι. At Th. 676, Al. 305, 331 this word is used in a prescription and followed by the medicament in the acc. In the first place Σ gloss χορτάσαι, κορεσθῆναι, ἐμπλησθῆναι, and assert that it is an imperatival inf.; in the second they gloss κόρεσον. They associate it therefore with the Homeric ἄσαι, now usually assigned to ἄω (C),¹ and in that company the passages are found in the *Thesaurus* (s.vv. ἄδω, ἄσαι). The construction throws some doubt on this, for in Homer ἄω is constructed either with acc. (once alone) and gen. (once dat.) or intransitively with gen., but N. often uses κορέννυμι, κορέσκω, κορέω of administering medicine, and if the construction is admitted, the sense is suitable. Anyhow the passages should appear somewhere, and at present, so far as I can discover, they do not.

ἀτμένιος, 'loilsome, prepared with trouble, Al. 178, 426', and so Σ. The adj. in both places is applied to oil used in prescriptions, and the qualification, to say nothing of its obscurity, is quite irrelevant. Does N. perhaps mean a low grade of oil such as slaves use, and employ the adj. as δούλιος is employed with ἐσθής, τροφή, et sim.? Cf. Hor. Sat. 1. 6. 123 unguor oliuo | non quo fraudatis immundus Natta lucernis, and see Blümner, *Tech.* 1². 357.

+ αὐγή, αὐγὰς ἡελίου, days, Th. 275. Cf. ἀκρίς above.

+ αὐλῆς, bedtime, Th. 58.

αὐξίς. A poisonous draught made from the sea-hare tastes fishy, Al. 468 νεπόδων ἀτε σαπρυνθέντων | ἥ καὶ ἄρρῦπτων ὅποταν λοιπὸς αὐξίδα χραινῃ, and αὐξίς according to L. means 'younge of the tunny', or according to Σ (followed by OSch.) ὥμα, which is hardly less absurd. I should guess the meaning to be *when scales taint the dish* in which it is cooked or served. Bentley conjectured ἀξίδα but did not say what it was to mean.² Perhaps a lost meaning of αὐξίς is more probable than a corruption.

+ αὐχένιος, necky, Th. 871. See below s.v. ἄλοσχος.

ἀφουσγετός. Al. 341 ὕδρωψ | τυμπανόεις ἀνὰ μέσσον ἀφουσγετός ὀμφαλὸν Ἱζει. 'Fillthy', connecting the adj. with the noun. But at 584 it is attached to νέκταρ, and means *abundant*, as it may well do here. The adj. occurs nowhere else, and indeed the v.l. ἀφουσγετόν (with Ἱζει trans.) may be right.

βάμμα, 'sauce, Th. 622'. It is a remedy consisting of boiled frogs (what did this lexicographer suppose the *Theriaca* to be about?), and *lotion* would serve. But βάμμα occurs half a dozen times in N., and in all cases in Al. Σ insist that it means *vinegar*—probably rightly, for a specific ingredient rather than an excipient is suggested by most contexts. I think therefore that this meaning should be recognised, and that β. σύμβλων at Al. 49 should be explained with Σ to mean the mixture of vinegar and honey elsewhere called ὀξύμελι. I do not see what light 'Hsch. s.v. βάμβα' sheds on the question.³

*βορέομαι, feed intrans., Th. 394. From *P. Oxy.* 2221, where see Lobel.

βοσκ-άδιος, 'foddered, fattled, χῆν Al. 228. -άς, feeding, fed, νηδύς Th. 782, ὀρταλῖς

¹ The entry ἄω (C) requires reconsideration in any case. It gives 'satiate', with one reference out of eight in Homer and omitting those with acc. alone (Il. 24. 211) and with dat. for gen. (Il. 11. 818). Then 'II. mostly intr.', with four references out of five.

² Bentley's *Adversaria*, now in the British Museum, are in the margins of a copy of Gor-

raeus's edition. Those on Th. are published in *Museum Criticum*, i. 370, 445: those on Al. were transmitted to OSch. by E. Mehler *ex apparatu Gronoviano*. OSch. not unnaturally queried this word, but, whatever Bentley meant, it is what he wrote.

³ But if anyone wishes to know he must consult βάμμα in either edition of Schmidt.

Al. 293. 2. of birds *which feed themselves, not artificially fed*, *Aët.* 9. 30.¹ I think we may assume that the two adjs. are synonyms, and should mistrust a word to which two diametrically opposed meanings are assigned. The meaning given for *Aëtius* is correct, and should therefore be shared by *Al.* 228, 293, in the second of which it is supported by the gloss *νομάς*. In *Th.* 782 *βοσκός* means *greedy*; and this, if anyone prefers it, would serve in *Al.* 228.

**βραδύθω*, *move sluggishly*, *Th.* 372.

+*βυθός*, a *deep track*, *Th.* 570.

+*γνάπτω*, see *λάθαργος* below.

γογγύλος, '2 = *ἔλυθος*, *Th.* 855'. Pure fiction: the word is an adj., agrees with *κόκκυγες*, and is rightly explained in *Σ*.¹

+*γρᾶς*. *Al.* 91 *φιάρην δὲ ποτοῦ ἀποαίνυσο γρήν*—apparently *cream* rather than *scum*, for the milk is not said to be boiled.²

δανχμός, *Th.* 94 (cf. *Σ* ad loc.), *Al.* 199'. This is recorded as a synonym s.v. *δαῦκος*, 'an umbelliferous plant growing in Crete', but what *Σ* say is that if you prefer to read *δανχμός* it means *δάφνη πικρά*, and at *Al.* 199 we hear that Apollo wore it as a garland. Its gender (suppressed by L.) is fem.³

**δάγμα*, = *δήγμα*, *Th.* 119 v. l. *al.* ('*δάγμα*, v. *δάγμα*', and find no entry). Similarly *δράγμα* *Th.* 667, *δηχμός* *Al.* 119, *πνιχμός* *Al.* 365. The similar forms *βρυχμός* and *νύχμα* are recorded by L.

+*δήμιος*. *Al.* 160 *δήμια λαβράζουσι—ἐν τῷ δήμῳ* according to *Σ*, but *vulgarly* is more likely; [*Diosc.*] *Alex.* 9 (of the same sufferers) *λαλοῦσι μετ' αἰσχρολογίας*.

+*δήποτε*. Sometimes, *Al.* 383; alternatively *Th.* 683, *Al.* 133, *al.*, to introduce an alternative prescription. Other words often so used, and neglected by L., are *ὅτε*, *τοτέ*, *πολλάκι*.

διανθής, '*flowering in succession*, *ἀσφόδελος* *Th.* 534', which is nonsense. *Σ* guess variously though not thus, but the word is used and explained in Theophr. *H.P.* 1. 13. 2—*ἔτερον ἄνθος ἐν τῷ ἄνθει ἔχων κατὰ μέσον*, stamens and pistil being regarded as an inner *ἄνθος*: cf. *ἄλοσχος* below.

+*διασεύομαι*, *to be purged*, *γαστήρ* *Th.* 300.

**διατρυφής*, *broken up*, *Th.* 709 (s.v.l.). Cf. p. 115.

+*διείδον*, *διείσομαι* *Th.* 494, *διηγήσομαι*, *Σ*, though *distinguish* would serve.

διτοκέω, del. 'also *διτοκεύω* *Fr.* 73. 1'. The words are *θρέψαιω Δρακοντιάδας* [pigeons] *διτοκεύσας*, and the part. is obviously acc. fem. pl. A masc. part. from a verb meaning *to give birth* to might, I should have thought, have given pause to the most debonair lexicographer.

+*δορύκνιον*, is written with a *χ* by *Π* at *Al.* 376, and *Et. M.* 283. 38 recognises both spellings.

δοχαῖος, '*κραδίην* *Al.* 21'. The words are *τεύχεος ἤν κραδίην ἐπιδορπίου* (or *-ιον*) *οἱ δὲ δοχαῖν* | *κλείουσι στομάχοιο*, and the word, whether this or another, must be a noun meaning *receptacle*.

δρεπανηῖς, not 'poet. for foreg., *Fr.* 21' (i.e. *δρεπάνη*) but = *δρεπανοειδής*.

δύσθηρις. *Th.* 738 *aggressive* rather than '*hard to fight with*'.

+*ἐδανός*. *Al.* 162 *ἐξ ἐδανοῖο πόροις δέπας ἔμπλεον οἴνης* | *Πράμνιον αὐτοκρηές*, 180 *ὀπώρην* | *ῥυσαλέην ἐδανοῖο καὶ ἐκ ψυθῆς ἐλίναιο*, *Σ* 181 *ἐδανοῖο, τοῦ γλυκυτάτου γλεύκεος*. Neither passage is mentioned s.v. *ἐδανός* (the adj. applied to oil at *Il.* 14. 172 and explained to mean *ἡδύς, εὐώδης*), and despite the similar explanation in *Σ* 181 this

¹ The words are *κόκκυγας ἐρινάδος οἱ τε πρὸ ἄλλης* | *γογγύλοι ἐκφαίνουσιν ἀνοιδείοντες ὀπώρης*, and the inquirer s.v. *κόκκυξ* is also directed (via *ἔλυθος*) to *ἔλυθος*. They are therefore to mean *ἔλόνθους, ἔλόνθους τε*.

² L. says 'scum of boiled milk' citing two passages neither of which mentions milk.

³ OSch. accepted *δανχός* from Bergk (see *Hippon. fr.* 2; Ahrens, *Dial. Dor.* 532; L. s.v. *δαίχνα*), but there is no trace of *ν* in N.'s MSS.

must be a different word, denoting, like *ψίθιος*, a type of vine and wine. As the original meanings of *εδανός* and *ψίθιος*, like those of *Πράμνιος* and *Βύβλινος*, are lost I do not see how either adj. can be translated.¹

**ἐκβδάλλομαι*, *purge by clyster*, *Al.* 322 (v. L. s.v. *ἐκφλοίομαι*).

ἐλαιίης, means 'of the olive tree' at *Non. D.* 11. 510, but transfer '*φλοιός Th.* 676' to 'II. *oily*'. The next word is *κρότῳ*.

ἐμβαρύθω, del. *ὑρον*, *κράατι Th.* 324'. The words mean *it has a heavy head*.

ἐμβρύκω, 'v.l. in *Th.* 824'. True; but if *ἐμπρήσασα* is preferred (as I think it should be), the meaning (apparently *strike with panic*) should be registered s.v. *ἐμπύμπρημι*. *Ἐμβρύκω* with no v.l. may be cited from *Th.* 271.

ἐμπελάδην. *Al.* 215 *βοάα ἃ τις ἐμπελάδην φῶς* | *ἀμφιβρότην κώδειαν ἀπὸ ξιφείσων ἀμνηθείς*. For the shouts of the decapitated see Leaf or Ameis on *Il.* 10. 457, but the adv. cannot mean '*near, hard by*'. It must be temporal—*on the instant*, or the like.

+ *ἐμπύμπρημι*, see *ἐμβρύκω* above.

ἐμπιπίσκω. Med. *steep* or *saturate*, not '*fill oneself Th.* 573, *Al.* 320'. And Pass. not '*of liquor, to be drunk*, *Νύμφαις ἐμπισθέν Th.* 624'. The part. agrees with *σύνταο κάρη*, and the words quoted mean *administered in water*.

**ἐμπλεῖω* = *ἐμπύμπλημι*, *Al.* 613.

ἐμπλήδην, not '*fully, as a whole, Al.* 129', but apparently *together with*.

ἐμπλην, at *Th.* 322 *κεράων ἐμπλην δέμας ἀμμορον*, is glossed *χωρίς*, but the word is then superfluous and I should have thought *nearly* more probable. '*E.* (A) means *near* in a local sense at *Il.* 2. 526—but let herpetologists pronounce on the appearance of a *σηπεδιών*, which they have so far failed to identify. '*Besides, except*' is nonsense.

+ *ἐμφέρω*, not cited from N. by L., has a usual meaning at *Al.* 23, and might have one at *Th.* 279 *πελιὸς δέ οἱ ἐμφέρεται χρώς* (*a livid colour invades him*), but *Al.* 471 (of the sea-hare) is more difficult—*ὅς δ' ἦτοι ῥυπόεις μὲν ὑπ' ὀσπλίγγεσσιν ἀραιαῖς* | *τευθίδος ἐμφέρεται νεαλὴς γόνος ἢ ἄτε* (v.l. *ἀπὸ*) *τεύθου*, | *οἷά τε σηπιάδος*. I suspect this means *the creature with its slim and dingy tentacles looks like the young of the τευθίς*, or *τευθός*, or *σηπιάς*.² If so, *Th.* 279 will mean *his skin looks livid*. Such a sense for the verb is otherwise unknown, but unless it is capable of it it is hard to see how *ἐμφερής* acquired its meaning, and *Σ* are so far at any rate in agreement as to translate *δμοῖός ἐστι*.³ So also *Diosc.* 2. 18 *ἔοικε μικρᾷ τευθίδι*.

ἐμφόρβιος, '*eating away, consuming, Th.* 629'. The words are *στρομβεία . . . ἐ. νούσου*, and *restraining* is both a more suitable and a more probable meaning.

**ἐναλθής*, *a patient* (*θεραπείας ἐπιδεόμενον Σ*), *Al.* 586. The v.l. *ἀν-* seems inferior.

ἐνδατέομαι, 'II. Pass., *to be ground small, Th.* 509, acc. to *Σ*'. True; but *Σ* are obviously wrong. It means *to be mentioned, or commended*, and belongs to I. 2. a.

ἐνελίσσω, 'Pass., *to be wrapped in, ὀλίγω ὄγμῳ Al.* 287'. The subject is wind in the stomach, and I do not see how this can be wrapped in an *ὄγμος* or indeed in anything else. *Σ* explain *ὄγμῳ* obscurely as *τῷ εὐθὺς ἀναφερομένῳ πνεύματι*, *ἄρτι δὲ καὶ τῷ φερομένῳ*, but I should suppose the meaning to be *moves round in the stomach on a short (or narrow) track*—*διαδρομὰς ἔνδον ἀποκλεισθὲν ἀπεργάζεται*, *Eutecnius*. *Ἀνελίσσω* is similarly used of wind at *Al.* 596.

¹ 'Pramnian' was apparently dry and astringent (*Ath.* 1. 30 B), and as according to 162 it could be produced from the 'hedanian' grape, the statement of *Σ* that the latter was very sweet is difficult to believe. The same note says that the 'psithian' is another name for 'Pramnian', and *Diosc.* 5. 5 describes an astringent made from this grape, but gathered before it is ripe. *Eubulus* however speaks (*fr.* 138) of sweet 'psythian'. '*Ἐδανός* in this connexion does not occur

elsewhere, but *Hsch.* *ἐδάνη· εἶδος ἀμπέλου* may be relevant.

² This is essentially JGSch.'s view also. I take the prepositional phrase with *ῥυπόεις*.

³ *Νεωστὶ γεννηθεὶς ὁμοῖός ἐστι ταῖς θριξὶ . . . τῆς τευθίδος*. This disregards *ὑπὸ* and leaves *ἄτε* and *οἷα* unintelligible. *Eutecnius* *ὑπὸ ταῖς τῆς τευθίδος ἢ τεύθου πλεκτάναις φέρεται* (to say nothing of other difficulties) also disregards them.

*έννεάκεντρος, with many stings, *Fr.* 37—though this may be a false memory of *Th.* 781, where see Σ.

ένοδομος, 'sweet-smelling, fresh, *Th.* 41'. The noun is κέρας, and as it is apparently to be burnt, *stinking* or *pungent* is no doubt meant.

ένοππή, ταύρων *Th.* 171 means *battle*, not 'voice'.

ένσκελλω, v. σκέλλω below.

έντερον, II. ε. γῆς *Th.* 388, *worms*, not 'worm-casts'.

+ἐπαέξω, *establish*, ἀέθλους *Al.* 606.

ἐπαιονάω. *Med.* is not 'intr.' at *Al.* 463.

*ἐπίκριος, on a beam, prob. in *Th.* 198 (as *L.* s.v. ἱκρία implies).

ἐπιλλίξω, 'blink, when drowsy, *Th.* 163'. Snakes cannot blink, for they have no eyelids. This mistake might possibly be N.'s, but at *Th.* 33, also of a torpid snake, he says ὀμμασιν ἀμβλώσσει. Since ἄλλος means *eye*, the verb perhaps = ἐποφθαλμέω, *stare*, have a fixed gaze.

*ἐπιλλύξω, *cough*, ξηρά, prob. in *Al.* 81.

ἐπιπροθέω, 'run on farther, *Th.* 382'. The subject is μάλκαι, the meaning rather *break out* than *spread*.

ἐπιπρονεύω, 'lean forward over, *Th.* 374'. It means *project*.

+ἐπισεύω, *induce*, λεῦκαι ἔφηλιν *Th.* 333. The pl. λείκαι should also be mentioned since it means the complaint, not *spots*.

ἐπιτηλίσ, v. θυλακίς below.

*ἐπιτυρόμαι, *curdle*, *Al.* 364 (v. *L.* s.v. ἐπιτρομβόμαι).

+ἔπω (A), ἀμφίς ε. = ἀμφιέπω, *honour*, *Th.* 627.

+ἐρημόω, *destroy*, ὕρακας *Al.* 37.

+εὐγλαγής, and -ος. 'Abounding in milk' is a suitable rendering at *Q.S.* 13. 260 and *Il.* 16. 642 (where it is f.l.), but in none of the three passages cited; and at *Th.* 617 it means *with milky juice* (τιθύμαλλος).

εὐζηλος, *Al.* 9 = ἀρίζηλος, not 'enviable'.

*ἐχθραλέος, = ἐχθρός, prob. in *Al.* 594.

ἔχys II. [a plant]¹ del. 'Th. 636', where *OSch.*'s text is ῥίζας ἐχίεσσιν ἀρωγούς, and ε. of course means *vipers*. But all MSS. have ὀφίεσσιν, and the emendation seems improbable.

ζαλάω, 'ζαλώωσα . . . χάλαζα driving hail, *Th.* 252'—a remarkable sequela of snake-bite. The words mean a *raging eruption* of the skin, and the collective sing. χάλαζα should be noted s.v. Cf. 778.

+ζωγρέω. *Th.* 51 (in a fumigation) βαρύδομος ἐνὶ φλογὶ ζωγρηθεῖσα | χαλβάνη. The text is insecure (v. *L.* s.v. μοιράω), but if this is right, I suppose it means *stimulated* to give off its odour, and should appear under II.

ἥλιθα II. 'Al. 25, cf. 140'. But in the first place it is probably, and in the second necessarily, the n. pl. of an unrecorded adj.

+ἡπειρος, pl. ἡπείροισι, on land, *Th.* 827.²

+θεμέλια. The sing. occurs at *Th.* 608, where it means *abode*.

θοόω. *Th.* 228 τεθωαμένος means *enraged*, not *made sharp*, and belongs to 'II. metaph.'

¹ This is a convenient place to register a protest against *L.*'s habit of directing the inquirer to his destination by the most roundabout route: 'ἔχys II. = ἔχyon II': 'ἔχyon II. = ὠκιμοειδές': 'ὠκιμοειδές, catchfly. 2. = χαμαιλέων μέλας. 3. = κλυνοπόδιον. 4. = ἔρινος, small rampon.' If, after looking up χαμαιλέων and κλυνοπόδιον and finding himself left to choose from

four alternatives for ἔχys, he has sufficient energy to look up ἔρινος, he will find no word of small rampon but 'a plant like basil. 2. = ἐπιμήδιον': and, finally, that ἐπιμήδιον is 'an unidentified plant'.

² The pl. μυρίαί ἄπειροι *Theoc.* 17. 77 also calls for mention.

θριδα
not 'like
which is
I do not
*θρύψω
θυλακίς
Ael., but
two spec
κερατῖτις
thought

+ θύω
+ θώω
+ ἰθύω
+ ἱκμία
*ισαίω
ἰχθυόω
κάλυψω
*κέρω
κηραίνω
Hsch.) is
*κηρύσσω
+ κλέω
κλώθοντες
θάλλοντες
Al. 93 χ
τῶ ὥς ν
κνησάω
+ κόω
so print

*κρύω
you dis
κρυόω
κύμα
Σ not 'α
(Al. 120
the me
δξύβαφος

*κύω
s.v. κα
+ κυ
χαμαικ
λάθω
are also
interpr
lines a
λάθαρ
only 'α
he war
λόγος

¹ The
this mis
² Wh

θριδακίς. *Th.* 838 *lettuce-like*, not 'of the lettuce'. Conversely *κραμβήεις* *Al.* 330 *of*, not 'like a cabbage', and similarly *δρυανόεις* *Th.* 65. At *Al.* 48 *πούς* (*χαμελαίη*), which is not in *L.*, means neither *grassy* nor, to judge from *Diosc.* 4. 171 f., *grass-like*. I do not know whether *herbal* or *medicinal* is possible.

***θρύπτειρα** (or -*ηρα*), *disruptive*, *κονή* *Al.* 370 (v. *L.* s.v. *ρύπτειρα*).

θυλακίς, '= *θυλάκιον* *II.* [*seed-capsule*] *Ael. NA* 6. 43, *Th.* 852, this is correct for *Ael.*, but *N.* says *περιβρίθουσα τε μήκων* | *θυλακίς ἢ ἐπιτηλὶς*, meaning, as *Σ* observe, two species of poppy—no doubt those which *Diosc.* 4. 64. 1 and 65 calls *θυλακίτις* and *κερατίτις*. *L.* identifies *ἐπιτηλὶς* but treats that word too as a noun.¹ I should have thought both were adj.

+**θύος**, *fragrant oil*, *Al.* 203, 452.

+**θώραξ**, *II.* pl. *breast* of a chicken, *Al.* 388.

+**ἰθύς** (*B.*) *length*, *μήκος τε καὶ ἰ.* *Th.* 398.

+**ἱκμαίνω**, *strain*, *Al.* 97.

***ἰσαίω**, = *ἰσώω*, *Al.* 399.

ἰχνευτής does not '= *ἰχνεύμων* 1' in *Th.* 195 but is used adjectivally.

κάλυμμα, 3. *Th.* 906, *aura mater*, not 'skull'.

***κέρβερος**, a kind of toad or frog, *Σ* *Al.* 578.

κηραφίς, 'a kind of *locust*', *Al.* 394. Pure fiction. The word (glossed *κάραβος* in *Hsch.*) is in the middle of a list of shell-fish.

***κηριτρόφος**, not *κηροτ-*, is the form favoured by the MSS. at *Th.* 192.

+**κλώθω**. *Th.* 647 *κλώθοντος ἐν ἀρπέξῃσιν ἐρίνου* (*Σ* v.l. *χλοάοντος*), *Al.* 528 *ῥυτῆς κλώθοντα περὶ σπάδικα κολούσας* (v.l. *κλωσθέντα*). The second is glossed *χλωρὸν θάλλοντα καὶ χλοάζοντα*, and there is clearly a *prima facie* case for this meaning.² *Al.* 93 *χυλῶ ἐνὶ κλώθοντι*, if sound, may then mean *in fresh sap*³—and *Σ*'s explanation, *τῷ ὡς νῆμα κλωθομένῳ χυλῷ*, though recorded in *L.*, is really too ridiculous.

κνηστήρ, *grater*, not 'scraping-knife'. It has teeth.

+**κόρχορος** is written *κόρκ-* by all MSS. at *Th.* 626, and by most at 864, and *OSch.* so prints it.

***κροκάω**, *to be yellow*, *κροκῶντες* *Fr.* 74. 22. (Or add this meaning to *κροκόω* if you disagree with *Lobeck Rhem.* 186.)

κρυσταίνομαι, del. 'with cold, freeze'. It is what befalls bull's blood in the stomach.

κύμβος, *δ*, (which should be cited from *Sophr.* 165) at *Th.* 526 means according to *Σ* not 'cup' but *sauceboat*. This may be right, for in the sense of *cup* *N.* has *κύμβος*, *τό*, (*Al.* 129) and *κύμβη*, though I do not see how the mysterious epithet *τραπεζήεις* makes the meaning clear. Still, one would welcome a more precise measure, and *N.* uses *δξύβαφον* with that meaning at 598.

***κύμη**, *Fr.* 85. 5. The fragment is foully corrupt but *L.* has vouched for this word s.v. *κακόχροος*. I doubt if, as *OSch.* thought, it = *κύμα* *II.* 2.

+**κυπάρισσος**. *Th.* 910 *ποιῖν κυπάρισσον ἀμέργεο*, meaning according to *Eutecnius* *χαμαικυπάρισσος*. Enter also s.v. *πόα*.

λάθαργος, 'bit of leather', *Th.* 423, cf. *Hsch.* *II.* = *σκάληξ*, *Id.* Both meanings are also given by *Σ*, and they should be presented not as equally valid but as rival interpretations of *N.*, of which the first, right or wrong, is the more plausible. The lines are *πλάδωντα περὶ σκύλα καὶ δέρε' ἵππων* | *γναπτόμενοι μυδῶσιν ὑπ' ἀρβήλοισι λάθαργοι*. All MSS. but one have *γναμπτόμενοι*, and he who looks up *γνάπτω* will find only '= *γνάμπτω*'. He should be directed to *κνάπτω*, where he will discover what he wants.

λάχνη, 'II. metaph. leafage', *Al.* 410, though *N.* tells us to shave it from a patient's

¹ Though Sir W. Thiselton-Dyer did not make not guess.
this mistake in *J. Phil.* xxxiii. 204.

² Whether connected with *κλών*, *κλάδος*, I will *χλώντι*, and *gruel* seems more likely than *sap*.

³ Knox (Headlam, *Herodas*, lvii) proposed

head—a blunder derived from a ridiculous interpretation in one scholium on the line.

+λείριον, flower of the ἔχis, *Th.* 543.

λευκός II. 2, not 'epith. of ἡρυγγος, *white*, *Th.* 849' but of ποίη, λ. π. being, according to Antigonius in *Σ*, λευκάνθεμος, ἡ. L. records only λευκάνθεμον, and -μός.

+λευκή, v. ἐπισεύω above.

λόπιμος, 'ον, *easily stripped*, of nuts which have a skin and not a shell, *Fr.* 76, *Sor. ap. Gal.* 12. 420, cf. *Gal.* 6. 621, *Hsch.* 'Λόπιμον in *Fr.* 76 is a noun meaning *chestnut* (cf. *Ath.* 2. 53 B), as it is in *Hsch.* and *Diosc.* 1. 106; λόπιμος also a noun with the same meaning in *Gal.* 6. 621; at 12. 420¹ the gender cannot be discerned.

λυκοσπᾶς, 'torn by wolves, epith. of bees *Th.* 742 (because generated from corpses of oxen torn by wolves, *Σ* ad loc.). In N.'s MSS. the adj. belongs to bulls not bees, but *Σ* attach it to the bees and offer alternative meanings. OSch. thought it meant *swift*, but as we have just been told (734) of a spider δ δὲ λύκον εἵσατο μορφῇ | μυιάων ὀλετήρος and preys on bees, a less improbable explanation, if the adj. really belongs to the bees, lies near at hand. On wolf-spiders see *Arist. H.A.* 623².

μάκτρα, 'III mortar for pounding drugs, *Th.* 708'. It is for separating serum from clotting blood, and despite its derivation must, I think, mean *colander*. Cf. OSch., p. 190.

μάλκιος, for 'Poet. ap. *Σ Th.* 382' read *Nic. Fr.* 22.

*μελιανθής, *sweet*, οἶνη prob. in *Al.* 58.

*μελισσόφυτον, τό, . . . *Th.* 677'. Read μελισσόφυτος, ἡ.²

+μετακίωθω, *avenge*, πατρός λώβην *Th.* 132.

μετεξέτεροι. It would be more useful to learn that this occurs in *Fr.* 76³ and means *others* than that it does not occur at *Th.* 588.

μίλτος, '2. *red lead* . . . μ. *Λημνίς Th.* 864'. This substance is frequently prescribed by ancient physicians, but we need not consider whether they are likely to have prescribed red lead, for the workings in Lemnos, which were visited by Galen (12. 171), are still open. They produce a silicate of aluminium and iron devoid of lead,⁴ and *Th.* 864 must therefore join I. 'red earth, red ochre, ruddle'.

μολουρίς. A snake preys on μολουρίδας ἢ βατραχίδας—'locust', *Th.* 416; cf. μελουρίς, μολουρίς'. The last two words are glossed ἀκρίς, and so *Σ* here, though less confidently (ζῳόν ἐστιν ὅμοιον ἀκρίδι. ἄλλοι δὲ σίλφῃ εἶναι ὁμοῖον φασί: cf. *Miller Mél. lit. gr.* 218). But at *Th.* 491 μόλουρος seems to be a snake, or at any rate a reptile, and I should have thought μολουρίς likely to be the same.

μονήρης, *Al.* 400 *single*, not 'solitary'; v. ἀκρίς above.

μορέω, 'πυρὸς μεμορημένον ἀγαῖς, i.e. *boiled over a fire Al.* 229 (unless from μείρομαι (A) q.v.)'. *Boiled* is correct, but derives from the preceding words ὀρταλιχῆα | ὕδασιν ἐντήξαι, and μείρομαι merely sends you back to μορέω—wrongly, I think. *Σ* paraphrase δεδασμένον, and μείρομαι is capable of this meaning (cf. *Arat.* 1054). The words are somewhat awkwardly disposed, but I suppose they mean *divide up and stew in water over a bright fire*.

μορόεις, 'II. (μόρος) *fatal, deadly*, ποτόν, *Al.* 130, 136; μορόεντος ἐλαίης, *dub. sens., Al.* 455'. *Deadly* might pass at *Al.* 569, where the adj. is applied to a toad or tree-frog from which a poison may be prepared (κακοποιός, μόρον ἄγων, *Σ*), but it is quite inappropriate to the two passages cited, for in the first the ποτόν is the posset on which

¹ This is λοπίμου τῶν παγίων γο (= οὐγκία) γ', but πάγων '3. in plants *Gal.* 12. 420' is not very helpful. I suppose *chestnut-beards* may be the silky fibres which protrude from the pointed end of a sweet chestnut.

² N. continues ἡλείου τροπαῖς ἰσάνυμον ἔρνος, | ἦ θ' Ὑπεριονίδας παλινστρέπτοις κελεύουσιν |

τεκμαίρει. This plant, usually ἡλιοτρόπιον, is called -τροπος without indication of gender in *Ps.-Diosc.* 4. 190. L. says ὁ, but N.'s relative suggests that it is fem.

³ And in *Th.* 414, which is no doubt spurious.

⁴ A detailed analysis will be found in *Rev. Arch.*, 3rd ser., xxvii. 321.

Demeter b
Al. 455 it i
δολόεις, ἡε
this word
fateful mig
taken toge
for the to
τρίγληνα ο
1. 152, and
adj. occur
μυληβ
conjecture
millstone.³

+ μύω
μεμυκότα
'growing i
+ νέατο
νεβρο

ζόρκες—'b
substantiv
and if v.
assert tha
so used, a
δορκάδος.⁵

νεήμε
suppose.

νεόκμ
and in OS
νεόκμητος
νήϊος,

χονται ὑπ
it as it we

+ ὄγμ
+ ὄδο
οἶνοβ

or pomeg

ὀκέλλ

νώτου βα

that δέμ

as it is s

+ ὄλυ

it should

ὀκλή

πεσοῦσαν

¹ The o

one passag

the text w

² Ebelin

in the Ho

similar to

A. Goebel

³ Cf. D

Demeter broke her fast, and in the second goose-broth for an invalid. As regards *Al.* 455 it is perhaps to be noted that other adj. in -οεις have synonyms in -ιος (e.g. δολόεις, ἡερόεις, ουρανόεις), that Athena's sacred olives were called *Μορίαί*, and that this word too was sometimes connected with μόρος (*Σ Ar. Nub.* 1005). Still, though *fateful* might serve at *Al.* 130, no such connexion seems plausible at 136 or 455,¹ and taken together the four passages suggest a meaning akin to *λαμπρός* or *λιπαρός*—*sleek* for the toad, *rich* or *oily* for the olive and the drinks. It will suit also the ἔρματα τριγύληνα of *Il.* 14. 183, *Od.* 18. 298, and the splendid armour of Penthesilea at *Q.S.* 1. 152, and will thus have the advantage of covering all six passages in which the adj. occurs.²

μυληβόρος, 'millstone-eating, μνός οἷα μυληβόρου *Th.* 446'—a strange diet. OSch. conjectured ἀμυλη-, unnecessarily I think, for λειχομύλη is not held to mean *lick-millstone*.³ L. has an entry for the variant νυχη- but not for μυχη-.

+ μύωψ in *Th.* 626 κόρκορον ἢ μύωπα, πανάκτειόν τε κονίλην is probably an adj. = μεμυκότα φύλλα ἔχοντα (as *Σ* say of the variant ἢ μυσέντα),⁴ but if a plant it is not 'growing in the Achelous'.

+ νέατος, v. πλαδάω below.

νεβροτόκος. *Th.* 141 ἔξοχα γὰρ δολιχοῖσι κυνωπησταῖς κοτέουσι | νεβροτόκοι καὶ ζόρκες—'bringing forth fawns'. I think however that *Σ* are right in regarding ν. as substantival = ἔλαφοι, for it is ἔλαφοι who are usually credited with hostility to snakes, and if ν. is adjectival καὶ performs no useful function in the sentence. I will not assert that a roe-deer fawn could not be called νεβρός, but I have not found the word so used, and at *Th.* 578 ἢ προκός ἢ νεβροῖο *Σ* explain the first noun as τοῦ τέκνου τῆς δορκάδος.⁵

νεήμελκτος, 'newly milked *Al.* 311'. The noun is πέλλη—full of new milk I suppose.

νεόκμητος, 'newly wrought, *Th.* 498'. In no text of the line is this meaning suitable, and in OSch.'s the words are ποίας νεοκμητᾶς, the adj. means *fresh*, and is not part of νεόκμητος.

νήϊος, 'νήϊα alone, oars, *Th.* 814'. The adj. agrees with πτερά, and ν. θ' ὡς σπέρχονται ὑπὸ πτερά θηρὶ κιοῦση (of a millepede) means *as it moves, there speed beneath it as it were the oars of a ship*. Θήρ, ἦ, should be recorded hence.

+ ὄγμος, (probably) *wheel-rut*, *Th.* 371, and v. ἐνελίσσω above.

+ ὀδοῦρός, = ὀδίτης, *Th.* 180, where ὀδίτης is a v.l., probably from a gloss.

οἰνοβρώς, 'eaten with wine, *Al.* 493'. But οἷ. βορή means *flesh of grapes*, or possibly of pomegranates.

ὀκέλλω. *Th.* 294 δοχμὰ δ' ἐπισκάζων ἄλιγον δέμας οἷα κεράσσης | μέσσου ὄγ' ἐκ νώτου βαῖον πλόον αἰὲν ὀκέλλει: 'πλόον ὁ. steer one's course'. I should have thought that δέμας was the object (*steers its body on short journeys*), and that ἐπισκάζων was, as it is said to be, abs. I shall have more to say on the lines in Section III (p. 113).

+ ὀλισθάνω. *Al.* 89 ὄφρ' ἂν ὀλισθήρασα χεῖρ κακὰ φάρμακα νηδύς. If ὁ. is here causal it should appear under II. 2. If not, the meaning *lubricated* should be given.

ὀλκήεις. *Th.* 650 ἀνήρσοιο τὸ διπλὸν ἄχθος αἶραι | ῥίζαις ὀλκήεσαν ὑπὸ πλάστιγγα πεσοῦσαν, 908 τρισσοῖς ὀλκήεσσαν ἰσοζυγίων ὀδελοῖσιν—'drawing the scale, weighty'. In

¹ The connexion would be plain at least for one passage if at *Q.S.* 4. 402 μορδέοντας ὑπὲρ κακοῦ the text were secure.

² Ebeling in *Lex. Hom.* s.v. favoured *splendidus* in the Homeric passages, and conclusions closely similar to my own were reached for all six by A. Goebel in *Philol.* xix. 424.

³ Cf. *Diss. Vind.* vi. 57.

⁴ Cf. *J. Phil.* xxxiii. 201.

⁵ Keller (*Thiere d. cl. All.* 78) held that these words, which occur in conjunction also at *Al.* 324, *Call. H.* 5. 91, mean *fallow* or *roe deer*, but I do not think that his passages (p. 364, n. 25) establish that νεβρός ever = δορκάς. His view that πρός, sometimes at any rate, means *fallow-deer* is better founded.

908 by weight would seem right; 650 f. I take (tentatively) to mean *let the double burden of anise raise the scale which sinks weighted with the roots mentioned in 646*.

ῥόσχος. *Th.* 869 νεαλεῖς τ' ὀρόβακχοι | σίδης ὑσμινόμεντος (Bentley: -τας codd.) ἐπιμόντας ῥόσχους | αὐχενίους ἵνα λεπτὰ πέριξ ἐνερεύθεται ἀνθή—'*pedicle of the pomegranate*', but I do not see how pedicles can be said ἐπιμύνει.¹ In the pomegranate, as in the apple, the fruit forms between the flower, and when the petals have fallen the sepals (or perianth) are left contracted round the stamens on the side of the fruit opposite to the stalk. I should translate *young fruits of the pomegranate with scarlet on its necky closing sepals where it reddens about the slender stamens*. For ἀνθή in the sense of stamens v. διανθήs above. Dr. D. G. Catcheside refers me to *Curtis's Bot. Magazine*, xliii (1816), pl. 1832B, where this stage of development is well shown. Immature pomegranates are prescribed by N. in other terms at *Al.* 609.

ὁμήρης, '= ὁμηρος, c. dat., *Al.* 70', that is to say it means '*pledge, surety, hostage*'. The words are βίτεια . . . ὁμήρεα κόψας | οἶνω, and the adj., like ἐνομήρης (*Al.* 238), means *together with*.

+ ὁμός. 'Ὁμή, ὁμήν, ὁμόν, ὁμός are glossed by Hsch. ὁμοῖος, ὁ αὐτός, *et sim.*, and ὁμόν c. dat. occurs there in an unidentified quotation. The constr., if not Salmassius's plausible conj. in *Th.* 817, should therefore be mentioned.

ὁμφαλόεις. *Al.* 7 ἄρκτον ὑπ' ὁμφαλόεσσαν 'because pointing to the pole (ὁμφαλός) of the heavens', and this explanation, which seems very far-fetched, is among those given by Σ. 'I, says N., addressing one Protagoras, 'live at Colophon, you ἄ. ὑπ' ὁ. at Cyzicus.' But Cyzicus is not all that more beneath the polestar, and the context seems to me much in favour of J. H. Voss's view² that Ἄρκτος is here the mountain, called at *Ap. Rh.* 1. 941, 1150 and *Strab.* 12. 575 Ἄρκτων ὄρος, on which part of Cyzicus was built. Voss thought it was called ὁ. *quod umbilicum seu antrum haberet in medio*, but ὁμφαλός and derivatives usually denote protuberances rather than cavities. I do not know whether bossy suits this particular mountain, nor whether N. was in a position to know.

ὄνος, 'VI. ὄνου πετάλειον, = φύλλον ὀνίτιδος, *Th.* 628', and ὀνόφυλλον 'gloss on ὄνου πετάλειον ὀριγάνου'. In fact it is a gloss on ὄνου, and ὀριγάνου is OSch.'s conjecture (for ὀριγανον) which he translates *folium ὀριγάνου ὀνίτιδος*. If this is right L. s.v. ὄνος needs correction, but ὀριγανον is mentioned in the previous line, and as 628 begins σὺν καί, ὀριγάνω would seem simpler. For the separation of preposition and noun see *Th.* 88, 728, *Al.* 145.

*οὔρος (B), ὁ, v. ὀρός.

ὀχλίω. *Al.* 505 τὰς μὲν [leeches] ἵνα πρώτιστον ὀχλιζόμενος ῥόος ὤσῃ. So Π, followed by OSch., but I cannot construe the part. and the other MSS. have ὀχλιζόμενας. Hsch. ὀχλιζόμενων συναγομένων, cited by L. should be joined by this line.

παιδέρως, *Fr.* 74. 55, is a plant grown for garlands, and therefore not '= holm-oak'. From *Dsc.* 3. 17, *Plin. N.H.* 22. 76, read in conjunction with *Paus.* 2. 10. 5, it would appear to be a pale-leaved form of acanthus.

παλαισταγής, 'οἶνος wine that has become oily from age, *Th.* 591'. Wine doesn't. It means merely *pressed long ago*, i.e. *old*.

παλίμβολος. The leaves of a kind of cabbage, says N. (*Fr.* 85. 6), are like πέλασιν οἷσι πέδιλα παλίμβολα κασσύνουσιν—'*turned or patched sandals*'. But what a turned sandal may be, or how π. should mean *patched* (even if that were appropriate) I do not know. Elsewhere the word is found in company with τρέπατος and παλίμπρατος, and is used of a worthless slave who passes from owner to owner (see *Kock on Men.* *fr.* 445 and add *Dio Chrys.* 31. 37). I should suppose it to mean *second-hand*. Why

¹ They might be said ἐπιμύνει, but I think OSch. was right in substituting ἐπιμύνει from Σ— and so s.v. does L.

² On *Cat.* 63. 5. Gorraeus had made the same suggestion.

the new so
N. could

*παρα
+παρα

*παρα
navel' for

πεδανός
of snakes

however
ῥυτῆς βλά

inappropri
lizard and

+περι
+περι

appropria
πηκτός

out to me
πηρίν

Hsch. is
πίμπρ

οὔλα; '(bu
This ver

in *Al.* 47
where in

*πίσος
+πίω

λαμυράτο
+πλο

δ' αὐτε π
κύστις β

is disclos
poisonin

—somet
at the lo

If this is
γαστρός

than the
πλά

(πλάττει
δρωτῆς

Theoph
chaff la

Terra-c
about k

resemble
normal

πλά
flat the

ἐπι.

¹ Ion
ἡπεδανός

πεδός

the new soles should differ in appearance from the original I cannot say, but perhaps N. could not either.

**παρασπαίρω*, *gasp beside*, *θυηλαῖς* Fr. 62. 2.

+ *παπατρέχω*, *flow uncontrolled*, *οὔρα* Th. 303.

**παρομφάλιος* Th. 290. See L. s.v. *κατομφάλιος*, but do not copy thence 'from the navel' for snakes do not have navels. *From the middle* is presumably meant.

πεδανός, 'low-growing, short . . . Th. 226, 289'. These passages relate to the tails of snakes and *short* is inappropriate in the first, *low-growing* in both. The word is however difficult, and there are also to be considered Th. 817 *σαῦροι* and Al. 306 *ῥυτῆς βλάσται*. Of the glosses *ἀσθενής*, *λεπτός*, *μικρός*, *ταπεινός* the last seems the least inappropriate. As applied to the rue, it would mean the lower shoots, and to the lizard and the snakes' tails perhaps *squat* or *flattened*.¹

+ *περιτρέφω*, *put forth flowers*, Th. 543; pf. intrans. ib. 542.

+ *περιφράζομαι*, *know about*, Th. 7 (according to Σ: *tell about* would be equally appropriate).

πηκτός III, 'ἀλς π. salt obtained from brine, Al. 518'. But, as Mr. Scholfield points out to me, this is described in the previous lines, and N. means, as Σ say, *rock salt*.

πηρίν, del. 'ἐλάφου πηρίς Hsch.' or transfer the Greek words to 'Th. 586', which Hsch. is citing.

πίμπρημι, 'of wounds, to be inflamed, Th. 306', but the subject is not *οὐλαί* but *οὐλα*; (but intrans. in act. *πίμπρησι δὲ χεῖλη* Al. 438).² 'II. blow up, distend . . . Al. 477'. This verb, which occurs eight times in N., certainly means *distend*, *cause to swell*, in Al. 477, and to judge from parallel passages in other authors has that sense everywhere in N. except at Th. 403, Al. 540.

**πίσσιος* (or -ον) in Σ Al. 594 is some form of comestible.

+ *πίων*, π. *ῥήματα* Th. 443 of a snake, and Aret. SA. 26 K. τὰ λευκὰ τῶν ὀφθαλμῶν λαμυρώτατα καὶ πίονα in pneumonia. The meaning is perhaps *glistening*.

+ *πλαδάω*. Al. 119 αἱ δ' ὅτε μὲν πλαδῶντι ποτῶ ἐπὶ χεῖλεσι δηχμών | τεύχουσιν, τοτὲ δ' αὖτε περὶ στόμα νείατα γαστρός | ἄλλοτε καὶ μεσάτη ἐπιδάκνεται ἄλγεσι νηδύς | ἥ κύστις βρωθεῖσα. These are blister-beetles, *κανθαρίδες*, whose presence in the drink is disclosed by its smell. I take N. to be enumerating various degrees of cantharides-poisoning, which penetrates the body further as the strength of the draught increases—sometimes in a weak infusion only the lips are affected, at others (i.e. in a stronger) at the lowest the opening of the stomach, or, if stronger still, the abdomen and bladder. If this is right the sense of *πλαδάω* and the adverbial *νείατα* should be recorded. *Στόμα γαστρός* occurs elsewhere in N. (Al. 20, 379) and seems to mean the pyloric rather than the cardiac orifice of the stomach.

πλάθανον, 'dish or mould in which bread, cakes, etc. were baked'. It is for kneading (*πλάττειν*) not baking, but Fr. 70. 1 f. is unexplained—*γογγυλίδας σπείροισι δὲ κυλινδρωτῆς ἐφ' ἁλως*, | *ὅφρ' ἂν ἴσαι πλαθάνουσι χαμηλότεραι θαλέθωσι*. It appears from Theophr. C.P. 5. 6. 9, Colum. 11. 3. 62, that *γογγυλίδες*, *ταραε*, were sown in a bed of chaff laid on the threshing-floor in order to secure small roots and broad heads. Terra-cottas show women kneading on round pedestal tables (or trays on pedestals) about knee-high.³ Let us therefore write *χαμηλοτέρους*—that when grown they may resemble low kneading-stands. The stands which they resemble will be lower than the normal height.

πλάτος. Th. 219 (vipers) τῶν ἤτοι βρεχμοὶ μὲν ἐπὶ πλάτος. If *ἐ. π.* means *broad* or *flat* the phrase should be registered, but perhaps it would be better to write *βρεχμοῖς ἐπ.*

¹ Ion Trag. 4 π. ὕπνος has no context, but *ἡπεδανός* seems much more probable. At Th. 662 *πεδόεις* seems to mean *squat*.

² But the subject might be *ιδρώς*.

³ See Blümner, *Tech.* i^o. 66.

+πλευρόν, of a ship, = τοίχος, *Th.* 269. See p. 113 below.

+πλέως, *thick*, *Th.* 119.

πόα, v. κυπάρισσος above.

*πολάζω, *haunt*, νήσοισι, prob. in *Th.* 482.

πολυστεφής, 'twisted in many a wreath, κότνωσ *Th.* 378'—despite *P. Oxy.* 2221 a very improbable meaning in the context, which describes rustics peeling branches for sticks. The adj. is applied to a snake at 490, and, *pace* Σ there, probably means *twisted* or *twisting* in both places—unless, as OSch. proposed at 490, -στρεφείας should be substituted.

+πολύστροφος. *Th.* 465 (a snake) τοῦ πάχετος μήκος τε πολύστροφον but its bite instantly produces alarming symptoms. Gesner proposed πολύστροπον, *variable*, which seems plainly the sense; but πολύστροφον should be capable of it. Σ guess wildly.

+πομφόλυξ, = πομφός, *Th.* 240.

+πότος, ὁ, = ποτόν, *Al.* 59.

*πράσιος, ἡ, = πράσιον, *Th.* 550 (at least the following rel. is ἡ τε): and for this ref. s.v. πράσιον substitute *Al.* 47.

πρημαδίη, ἡ, *Al.* 87 is an adj. not a noun, and should appear as -ιος, α, ον.

προδουπέω, del. 'before'.

πυρίτις, ' = πύρεθρον *Th.* 683, *Al.* 531', which may be right at *Th.* 683; but at *Al.* 531 ριζάδα τρίβε πυρίτιδα, I should have thought π. was an adj., and L. s.v. ρίζις seems to share that opinion.

*ράδαμος, v. ὀρόδαμος.

ρύμμα should be cited from *Al.* 96, not from 'Σ *Al.* 95'; similarly πύλη (in the *Addenda*) from *Al.* 22 or 138, rather than 'Σ *Al.* 119'.

*σείραιον, v. σίραιον.

+σίνος, pl. *inedible parts* of a fruit, *Al.* 231.

σίντης, 'with a fem. subst., σύνταο φάλαγγος *Th.* 715'. But φ. is masc. in *Arist. P.A.* 609¹⁶, and N. goes on with a masc. rel. '2. = ἔχης, *Th.* 623'. It does not—not even if, as Σ with no visible ground assert, N. is here talking of vipers.

σκαίός, del. 'IV *aslant*, *crooked*, of serpents, *Th.* 266'. *Clumsy* is as good or better sense, and Σ's πλάγιος may represent οἰζον σκολιήν. See p. 113.

σκέλλω II, 'intr. pf. act. . . to be parched, lean, dry . . . cf. *Th.* 718'. N. is fond of this pf., and the meanings given fit *Al.* 464 (skin), but much less well *Th.* 718, 766 (spiders' teeth and head), 789 (scorpion's claws)—chitinous parts of these creatures contrasted with their more squashable bodies. Solidity or hardness rather than dryness seems to be the essential idea.¹ L. s.v. ἐνσκέλλω, 'dry or wither up' records *Th.* 694, where the first meaning is correct, but not 785 where either is nonsense. A kind of scorpion which is a voracious feeder βουβώσι τυπήν ἀλίστον ἰάπτει | τοίη οἱ βούβρωστις ἐνέσκληκεν γενέσσει—perhaps so ravenous are its hard jaws.

*σμήνιγξ, = μῆνιγξ, prob. in *Th.* 557.

σπειράομαι, 'πέριξ . . . σπειρηθεῖς [δράκων] *Th.* 457'. Πέριξ qualifies ἰπτάμενον, not σπ.

+στεγαγός, *costive*, νηδύς *Al.* 367.

στεγνός, 'III. στεγνά περὰ wings joined by a membrane, like those of the bat, *Th.* 762', and στεγανόπους admittedly means *web-footed*. This however is an insect which N. compares to a moth, and Σ say ὑμενώδη ὡς τῶν ἀκρίδων, so why drag in bats? N.'s words are στεγνά καὶ ἔγχνοα, and I should have thought στ. meant the exact opposite of membranous—lepidopterous not hymenopterous. Unfortunately entomologists cannot solve the problem for the insect appears to be fabulous, but I admit that it may be related to the scorpion ἐνάριον καὶ πτηνόν, ὑμενόπτερον δὲ οἶα ταῖς ἀκρίσι καὶ τέττιξι καὶ νυκτερίσι τὰ περὰ with which *Lucian (Dips. 3)* credits Libya.

¹ Also at *Al.* 491, where τ' ἐσκληκότεα seems preferable to τὰ σκληρέα. Those who (with OSch.) choose the latter must add σκληρής to L.

σύγκο
fungi grow
rightly w
in a corru

*σουσ
σφεδα
I shall dis

+Τάρ
+τεκμ
+τέλο

τέρφο
cerned, a
shell of a
ἐπιδέδρομ
surface.

τετρά
Aglaias 2

*τετρ
+τήθ

τηνεσ
and τευν-
registered

τριπε
choice is
have τρι

τρίσφ
N. in *El.*
of a fem

+τρώ
*ὕδρ

+ὕππ
φιλός

ἐρπυλλος
κύπειρις,
στερεωτέ

(*H.P.* 4.
μάλιστα
tenaciou

φλόσ
at 355, b

at all (se
φον

OSch., f
ἰάπτει. I

*φύσ
φωκτ
meaning

¹ Of th
noted in
and I ha
μυγής. 'E
Al. 183 f.

σύγκолλος, 'glued together, βάρη Fr. 78'. This very corrupt frag. is about poisonous fungi growing on trees, and neither I nor anyone else can construe it. But if Casaubon rightly wrote σύγκολλα for σύκολλα it will mean *attached to* and involve a dat. missing in a corruption or lacuna.

*σουσκάμος, ὁ, = ὑσκάμος prob. in Al. 415. See p. 115.

σφεδανός, 'κάρηα Th. 642', but not 'vehement, violent' for it is the head of a plant. I shall discuss the meaning in Part III (p. 114).

+Τάρταρος, = βυθός, τ. ἰλνέσσα, of the Nile, Th. 203.

+τεκμαίρομαι, *reveal*, Al. 105.

+τέλος, *edge, perimeter*, ἄλωος Th. 546.

τέρφος, 'skin, shell, Al. 268; τάπιδος Th. 323'. In the first place a chestnut is concerned, and the outer *husk* is meant. In the second I do not know what the skin or shell of a rug may be. The words (of a snake) are ἡ δὲ νυ κροῖ | οἷη περ τάπιδος λασιῶ ἐπιδέδρομε τέρφει, and should mean *its colour, like that of a rug, is spread over a rough surface*. The τέρφος is therefore the snake's, not the rug's.

τετράμορος, Th. 106 (and 712) *a quarter*, not 'four parts', and so Σ and Aglaïas 25.

*τετραποδί, = -ποδητί, Al. 543 (s.v.l.).

+τήθη, = ὠτάριον III, Al. 396 (cf. L. s.v. ὠτίον II. 2).

τηνεσμός 'f. l. for τενεσμός in Al. 382, Hsch.' The MSS. agree in both places, and τειν- is Schmidt's conjecture in Hsch., but anyhow the meaning *gripping* should be registered in one place or other.

τριπετής, del. 'triple spread' (which is ridiculous), and for νέκταρ read πόσις. The choice is between τριπετή (πόσις) and τριτέι (νέκταρ), though it is true that some MSS. have τριπετεί.

τρίσφυλλον, 'τό . . . Th. 520'. The MSS. have τριοφ- but τὸ τρίσφυλλον is cited from N. in *El. M.* 279. 10. At Th. 520 however it is acc., and, as the following rel. shows, of a fem. noun.

+τρώω, τέτρυται, *is attenuated*, Th. 287 (quoted in L. s.v. μύουρος).

*ὕδρηεις, v. ἀνυλῆεις above.

+ὕπηνη, *palate*, Al. 16 (v. L. s.v. οὐρανόεις).

φιλόζωος, '2. b. *evergreen* Th. 68, Al. 274, 591'. The noun in the first two places is ἔρφυλλος, and the explanation comes from Σ on the second. At Al. 591 the noun is κύπειρις, and, *evergreen* being inappropriate, Σ change ground (διὰ τὸ ῥίζαν ἔχειν στερεωτέραν). Κύπειρις, we are told, is κύπειρον 2. *Cyperus rotundus*, and Theophrastus (*H.P.* 4. 10. 5), discussing the roots of this plant, says that they make it πάντων μάλιστα δυσώλεθρον. Al. 591 therefore, if not the other passages, should join '2.a. *tenacious of life*'.

φλόος, 'of the *slough* of serpents Th. 355, 392'. That is the meaning of γηραλέον φ. at 355, but the virtue resides in the adj., for at 392 φ. is new skin, if indeed it is skin at all (see *P. Oxy.* 2221).

φοινός. Al. 187 κείνο ποτὸν δὴ γάρ τε καρήατι φοινὸν ἰάπτει | νύκτα φέρον σκοτόεσσαν. OSch., followed by L., treats φ. as in agreement with ποτόν, and νύκτα as object of ἰάπτει. It seems much more likely that φ., whether noun or n. adj., = φονόν.

*φύσελος (or -ον), *wind* in the stomach, Σ Al. 287.

φωκτός, 'roasted, boiled, Fr. 68,¹ Dsc. *Eup.* 2. 39'. That is no doubt the proper meaning, and may be right in Dsc., but in N. it is not. He says that when you pour

¹ Of the few references to N. which I have noted in L.'s *Addenda* three relate to this frag., and I have cancelled in consequence a note on *μυγῆς*. Ἐκδαίνυμαι, *eat up*, may be supported by Al. 183 f., which should be cited, but Athenaeus

here paraphrases with προσφέρωμαι, and *serve*, if the meaning is possible, seems rather more suitable. The text however is hardly secure. The entry s.v. ἐγχεῖω I do not understand.

boiling broth on barley (κρίμων) you must put the lid on your casserole (or what-not), φωκτὸν γὰρ ἀνοιδάινει—that is when *stewed*.

+χάλαζα, v. ζαλάω above.

χαλινός, 'IV. 2. fangs of serpents, from their shape and position in the mouth, Th. 234'. The male viper has two fangs, the female more, and grips with its whole mouth, ἀμφὶ δὲ σαρκί | ρεία κεν εὐρινθέντας ἐπιφράσσαι χαλινούς—according to Σ, χωρογραφθέντας τοὺς ὀδόντας καὶ εὐρέας γυνομένους. But elsewhere in N. χ. always means *lips* or *jaws* (Al. 16, 117, 223, 337, 453), and so here—you can see from the marks left on the skin that the jaws have been opened wide.

χαμευνάς II, Th. 23 = χαμεύνη, not 'lair'. It is your bed, not theirs, from which the snakes are to be expelled.

χέλιον, 'crab's shell, Al. 561', though we have been talking of tortoises since 555, and are now hearing how Hermes constructed the first lyre.

χνοάω. Th. 29 ποίη | πρῶτα κυσκομένη σκιάει χλοάοντας ἰάμους is cited s.v. σκιάω, 'overshadow, make shady', but the first growth of grass does not provide much shade. Would it not be better to accept the poorly supported v. I. χνοάει σκιάοντας, and add a trans. sense to χνοάω—brings bloom to, or the like?

χολή II 'ink of the cuttle-fish, Al. 473, Th. 561'. In the second passage it is the gall-bladder of a boar, and its location is minutely described.

χοῦς (A), 'ὁ, also ἡ . . . Th. 103'. Th. 103 ἐν δὲ τρίτην μοῖραν ῥόδου χοῦς, ἣν τε θυωροί | πρῶτην μεσσατῆν τε πολύτριπτον καλέονται, that is, as Σ say, the third part of a chous, or four cotylae, of rose-oil. Now it is plain that what perfumers grade in three qualities is the whole product, not a particular quantity of it, that therefore ῥόδου, and neither μοῖρα nor χοῦς, should be the antecedent of ἣν,¹ and that this line is no evidence for χοῦς, ἡ.² I cannot emend ῥόδου³ and the only explanation of the fem. relative which occurs to me is that the trade-terms πρῶτην, etc., may imply a fem. noun (e.g. θλίψις, στάξις, στῆψις). If so, N., one of whose principal elegancies is to abandon at once for another the gender or number with which he has begun a sentence, would gaily welcome the chance, and attract his relative to it.

The second line is visibly corrupt. Of conjectures Reiske's πολύτριπτοι will not do, for a medium grade implies two others, not one. Klauser's μεσσατῆν, πολύτριπτον might serve, but copulas seem desirable, and I should write τε κλέονται.⁴ The same exchange of verbs was made by Dindorf in fr. 71. 5.

+χραισμέω. Th. 551, drink an infusion of horehound, and χραισμήσεις ὀφέσει—with-stand, be protected against, I suppose. Both meaning and construction should be registered.

¹ An alternative explanation in Σ is τῶν τριῶν ὄντων τῶν ῥοδίνων τῷ πρῶτῳ καὶ τῷ δευτέρῳ ὡς ἐξόχους φησὶ χρῆσθαι, and Eutecnius says τοῦ ῥοδίνου τοῦ εἰκῆ μὲν οὐδὲν οὐδ' ἀπλῶς κατεσκευασμένον, ἀλλ' ὃ φασι τοὺς μυροπώλους ὀνομάζειν τριπτόν. I do not understand the first, but both seem to regard μοῖρα as meaning *grade* or *quality*. Quite apart however from the difficulty of so interpreting the word, it is again the substance, not one sort of it, which is graded. Moreover, the quantities of all other ingredients in this prescription are specified. It is certainly odd that N. should name three qualities unless he intended to prescribe one rather than the other two, but perhaps he means professionally prepared rose-oil rather than your family recipe.

² The only other passage cited is Anaxandr. 41. 13, where it means a vessel, not a measure of

capacity. L. does not recognize this meaning, which may go with the fem. gender, and I can supply no other example of either unless of Χόες, the festival, counts for the meaning.

³ N. has ῥόδου and ῥίνου substantively elsewhere (Al. 241, 452) and where he adds a noun it is λίπος (Al. 155) or θύος (Al. 203), though μέρον would no doubt serve. If at Al. 239 he wrote ῥόδους θυὸν λίπος, which is doubtful, ῥ. presumably means *rose-tree*. It would be easy to write ῥοδίδος in 103, but this as described in Diosc. 1. 99. 3, Gal. 14. 133 is a solid substance, and one would expect with it a measure of weight, not of capacity.

⁴ Κλέεται is pass. in Fr. 71. 5, and elsewhere N. has only active forms of this verb, but it would take a nice grammarian indeed to distinguish his med. from his act. in meaning.

ψαίρω, I
ἀλκαῖν ψαί
entered un
ought, as 2
Manil. 2. r

In the
proper pla
of places w
tive. Here
editor of I
in my grav
is the earl
earliest or
where the
In regard
prescriptio
poets do s
be signific
unless (as
reason so
uvula. No
history ca
where,³ th
involved.

My lis
omissions
Still, it sh

ἀγκών
Pass. Th.
ἀκροσφα
gen. ἄλω
Th. 868.
'man's'
Al. 276.

II. 1. Al.
5. Al. 50.
βλάστη,
II. Th. 1
(A), intr.

¹ The s
probable
poems, bu
is virtual

² In a f
ings (e.g.
know whi

³ J.H.S.
⁴ When

ψαίρω, II 'of stars, *twinkle*, *Th.* 123'. The words are Πληάδων . . . αἱ θ' ὑπὸ Ταύρου | ἀλκαῖν ψαίρουσαι ὀλίζωνες φορέονται, and I should have thought *brush* (perhaps to be entered under ὑποψ-) much more likely. The Bull, being only head and shoulders, ought, as Σ Arat. 172 remark on this line, not to have a tail; but see Housman on Manil. 2. 199.

II

In the following list I have, to economize space, included a few small points whose proper place is in I, but in the main it consists of unrecorded forms, usages, etc., and of places where the omission of a reference to N. leaves the history of the word defective. Here there is, no doubt, some room for differences of opinion, and if the next editor of L. rejects some items of my proffered bounty I can undertake not to turn in my grave. My criteria however have been that N. should be included, (i) where he is the earliest¹ authority for a word, or for a particular meaning of a word; (ii) the earliest or only verse-authority for it; (iii) the first to use it in dactylic verse; or (iv) where the word or meaning is so rare that any additional example is worth record. In regard to (ii) however it may be held that if you cannot refrain from writing prescriptions in hexameters, you must needs name their ingredients whether other poets do so or not, and that the distinction between verse and prose thus ceases to be significant. I have therefore not included such words as ἄγχουσα and ἐλελίσφακος unless (as, e.g., ἐλξίνη) they qualify under (i).² I have excluded also for the same reason some other technical words such as κεκρύφαλος, *second stomach*, and κίον, *uvula*. Nor have I added N. as an authority for Homeric words whose subsequent history cannot be properly traced in L. (e.g. αἰγανέη, ἀφραίνω), for, as I have said elsewhere,³ this is a department in which L. is defective, and other poets besides N. are involved.

My list could no doubt be increased, for I have probably failed to record some omissions which I have noticed, and I have certainly not looked up every word in N. Still, it should do to go on with.

ἀγκών II. *arm of lyre*, *Al.* 562. Αἶδης, acc. Αἶδα (—οο), *Th.* 181. ἀδρύνω Pass. *Th.* 377. αἶρω V. 2. *Al.* 20. αἰγινόμευς *Al.* 39. αἰνελένη *Th.* 310. ἀκροσφαλής *Al.* 242. ἀλκαία, Ion. -η, *Th.* 123, 225. ἄλυσθαίνω *Al.* 141. ἄλως, gen. ἄλως, *Th.* 546, *Fr.* 70. 1. ἀμβροσία 4. b. *Fr.* 74. 28. ἄμυνω, *succour*, c. acc. *Th.* 868. ἀναμίγηδιν c. dat. *Al.* 558. ἀνατολή I. 4. *Th.* 635. ἀνδρακάς (B), del. 'man's'. ἀπερύκω Med. c. gen., *save from*, *Al.* 608. ἀπηθέω *Th.* 708. ἀποβρέχω *Al.* 276. ἀργεστής II. pl. *Al.* 175. ἄρκος (B) prob. in *Al.* 43. ἄρπη I. *Fr.* 73.⁴ II. 1. *Al.* 101. ἄτερθε II. *Th.* 242. αὐαλέος dat. pl. -έεσσι, *Th.* 938 (v.l.). αὐγή 5. *Al.* 501. αὐδάζομαι 2. *Th.* 464. ἀχράς *Th.* 512. ἄψος pl. (*limbs*) *Th.* 332. βλάστη, *birth*, *Al.* 2. βλήχων, acc. γληχῶ, *Al.* 128. βότρυσ, ἡ, *Al.* 185. γάστρα II. *Th.* 106. γρηῖος *Fr.* 62.⁵ δειρή II. sg. *Th.* 502.⁶ δεκάς III. *Th.* 102. δέω (A), intr. pf. 2 δέδηα, *Al.* 436.⁷ διάημι Pass. *Fr.* 74. 41. διπάλαιστος *Fr.* 74. 10.

¹ The second century B.C. seems to me a more probable date than the third for the extant poems, but for the present purpose this problem is virtually irrelevant.

² In a few cases where L. gives different meanings (e.g. ἄρον, φλόμος) the reader might like to know which L. supposed N. to mean.

³ *J.H.S.* lxii. 94.

⁴ Where it is plainly neither 'shearwater' nor

'lämmergeier'.

⁵ 'Ion. for γραιός', but as there is no entry for γραιός some might like also to know the meaning.

⁶ It is surely improbable that this word means in sing. 'ridge of a chain of hills', but in pl. 'gully, glen'. I should have thought that in either number it meant *col*.

⁷ And enter s.v. δέδηα, whence we are referred only to δαλω.

διπλάζω Med. Th. 79. ἐγείρω I. Med. Al. 456. εἰκαῖος 3. Th. 394. εἰνάς Al. 218. ἔκπυρος (v.l. for ἔμπ-) Th. 151.¹ ἐλξίνη Th. 537. ἐμπλάσσω 1. (v.l. -πάσσω) Al. 79. ἐναλίκιος, n. pl. adv. Al. 116. ἐνθλάω prob. in Th. 316. ἐνθρύπτω, Med. c. gen., Th. 606. ἐπιείκελος, abs. *alike*, Th. 211. ζάκορος Al. 217. ζοφοειδής Th. 256. ἡέ, ἡ Fr. 50, 74. 19.² ἡμέριος, pl. *mortals*, Th. 346. θέριος III. Th. 469 not 460. θηλή Al. 356, 359. θλίβω, Pass. aor. 1 Th. 290. θόρνυμαι, act. *thornuta* Th. 99. θυμολέων, of dog, Th. 671. θύμον, *θύμος*, δ, Fr. 92. ἱαμνοί add [ἱ]. ἱάπτω (B), c. acc. et dat., *inflict on*, Th. 784, Al. 187.³ ἱάς ἱ in arsi also Fr. 74. 2, so cite A.P. 7. 83. ἱγνύα, -ύσι Th. 278. ἰδμοσύνη Th. 346. ἰσθήρης, add *παγούροις* before '[ἰσ]'. ἰσθμός I. 2. Al. 80, 508. κάμψη 1. Th. 87. κάρα (A), *κάρη* prob. in Th. 642.⁴ κατακαρφής add 'cj. in' (cf. L. s.v. *ἀκαρφής*). καταπλέκω I. c. prob. in Th. 475. κατερείπω, aor. 2. trans. Th. 724. καυλός III. Th. 722. κεκαφηώς Al. 444. κήρυξ II. Al. 395. κλώσμα transfer Fr. 72 to signf. 2. κόρση 4. of a plant Al. 253. κοτύλη 3. a. Al. 45, al. Κρής, f. *Κρησίς* Al. 490. κριοφάγος Th. 50.⁵ κύαθος II. Th. 582, Al. 58. κύδιστος, sup. -ίστατος Th. 3. κυίσκομαι Th. 30. κώδεια, of poppy Fr. 74. 44. λήνος, *wool*, Al. 452. λίβανος I. ἡ Al. 107. λίτρον I. Al. 337, 532. μέλισσα III. Al. 374. μετρηδόν, by *measure*, Al. 203. μνίον ἱ Th. 787. μόγος 2. Th. 428. μύκης II. 1. Al. 103. μυζώδης Al. 381. ναί, μὴν Th. 51, 66, and often when expanding a theme.⁶ νιφόεις II. Th. 291. νύμφη II. 2 (*water*), pl. Th. 623, Al. 65, al. ὁ C. gen. fem. *τεῆς* (s.v.l.) Al. 618. ὀδάξω, II. Med., *bite*, Th. 306. ὀμαρτή Al. 378. ὄνυξ I. 1, ἐξ ὀνύχων Th. 251. ὄπος II. Th. 907. ὀρός 2. Th. 708. ὄσσε, dat. ὄσσω Th. 163 (v.l.). οὔρον (A) pl. Th. 303, οὔρος (A) (*rough breeze*) Th. 270. παμπήδην Al. 526. παραπλήξ II. Th. 776. πέπνυμαι, aor. imper. πνῦθι Σ Al. 13. περιστιγής Th. 749. περιφλίω, ἱ not ἱ.⁷ πεφυζότες, sing. Th. 128. πίνω, Pass. aor. ποθείσα, -έν Al. 432, Th. 622. πνιγμός 1. Al. 190, 365. πολύμνηστος II. Fr. 110. πολυσχιδής 2. Th. 39. πρόπας π. sing. adv. Th. 338. πυγών Th. 515. ράκίς I. Th. 533 v.l. ῥίνος I. pl. Th. 429.⁸ ῥύσις I. Al. 599. σηπεδών I. 2. pl. Th. 242. σιάλον I. Th. 86 (pl.). σικύα II. Th. 921. σίνος I. Th. 1. σπόρος II. 4. Al. 582. στέρνον II. *θυεῖς* Th. 91. στιφρός Fr. 69. 5. σφαῖρα 8. Th. 584. σφέλας, dat. -λα Th. 644.⁹ τανύφυλλος, ἐρείκη Th. 610.¹⁰ τάτις Th. 323 v.l. τοῖος V. pl. Th. 429. ὕδωρ, Ep. dat. ὕδατεσσι Fr. 79. φρίξ II. 2. Th. 778. φρύνη I. Al. 575. φύρω I. 1. c. gen. Th. 693. χαμαιαινώς, *θύμβρη* Th. 532. χαράσσω II. *bite*, of snake, Th. 545. χαύνος I. Th. 897. χῖδρον Fr. 68. 3. χιλός 2. (pl.) Th. 569. ψηχρός Th. 559 v.l.

III

In this section I have put together a few passages in which what I have to say is not concerned with the mistakes and omissions of Liddell and Scott.

Th. 164 ἀλλ' ὅταν ἡ δοῦπον νέον οὔασιν ἡέ τιν' αὐγὴν
ἀθρήση, νωθρόν μὲν ἀπὸ ῥέθεος βάλεν ὕπνον.

νωθρὴ II

This is the asp roused to action. *Νωθρόν* is the right sense, *νωθρή*, though O. Schneider's devotion to II led him to print it, the wrong. The gap between them may be bridged

¹ Meaning perhaps *irascible*.

² Also Numen. ap. Ath. 7. 295B.

³ v. I above, s.v.v. *σκελλω*, *φουός*.

⁴ And recognized by L. s.v. *σφεδανός*.

⁵ v. L. s.v. *κριοφάγος*.

⁶ See p. 117 below.

⁷ 'To be almost bursting with, *ἐλοφῆ*' is much to over-translate.

⁸ And *Od.* 5. 426, al.

⁹ OSch. printed ἡ σφέλαι ἡ from II, but the crasis (if he meant *σφέλαι*) is difficult.

¹⁰ Add also A.P. 7. 200. 'Pi. (?) *Oxy.* 426' is B. Fr. 4 Snell.

by νωθρὴ
to gloss

The vip
whereas
with rou
adverse
moveme
which h
steering
halting

I ov
is valid
Most sr
leaves i
of the A
is pecul
one loop
off at a
as its tr
to the c
segmen
are lifte

The
attemp
rately a
works b
like a cr

¹ e.g.

² O. S.
used (lik
it is not
and ding
continui

³ This
the surf
and doe
slopes w
frequent
moves s
to its c
suggeste

by *νωθῆ*. N., who does not use *νωθρός*, has *νωθής* at 222, 349, and the two adj. are used to gloss one another.¹

- Th. 264 τῶν ἥτοι σπείρησιν ὁ μὲν θοὸς ἀντία θίνει
ἀτραπὸν ἰθείαν δολιχῶ μηνύγματι γαστρός.
αὐτὰρ ὅγε σκαιὸς μεσάτῳ ἐπαλινδεται ὀλκῶ,
οἶμον ὁδοιπλανέων σκολιῇν τετρηχότι νώτῳ,
τράμπιος ὀλκαίης ἀκάτῳ ἵσος ἥ τε δι' ἄλμης
πλευρὸν ὅλον βάπτουσα κακοσταθέοντος ἀήτεω
270 εἰς ἄνεμον βεβίηται ἀπόκρουστος λιβὸς οὐρῳ.
294 δοχμὰ δ' ἐπισκάζων ὀλίγον δέμας οἷα κεράσσης
μέσσου ὄγ' ἐκ νώτου βαῖον πλόον αἰὲν ὀκέλλει
γαίῃ ἐπιθλίβων νηδύν.

The viper, says N., wriggles straight forward and fast with long windings of its belly, whereas the cerastes rolls clumsily forward with the middle of its body, meandering with rough back on a crooked course like the dinghy of a merchantman which in an adverse breeze forces its way to windward, dipping its gunwale under—in brief, its movements are like those of a boat towed behind a tacking ship.² The haemorrhoids, which he is discussing in 294, is an unidentified snake, and moves in the same way, steering its little body on short journeys from the middle of the back with oblique and halting motion.³

I owe to Professor James Gray the information that the distinction here drawn is valid, and that N. describes the movements of the cerastes with surprising accuracy. Most snakes normally writhe forward with a continuous flowing movement which leaves in sand or dust a serpentine track. The normal movement of the cerastes and of the American 'side-winder' (*Crotalus cerastes*), which has a similar sandy habitat, is peculiar. 'The progression is by a series of large loops of the body thrown forward; one loop follows another with perfect symmetry of alternation, while the snake moves off at a sharply oblique angle to the direction in which the head is pointing',⁴ leaving as its track a series of roughly parallel and straight lines, disconnected, and oblique to the direction in which the snake is moving. These are made by the segment or segments of the body which are at rest and in contact with the ground while others are lifted and advanced (cf. Th. 295).⁵

The movements of snakes are hard to understand, as may be seen from Aristotle's attempts (*H.A.* 490^a31, *I.A.* 707^b7); those of the cerastes hard both to discern accurately and to describe intelligibly, as may be seen not only from modern zoological works but from the cursory descriptions of Pausanias (8. 4. 7), who says that it moves like a crab, and of Philumenus (18. 1), who merely states that it does not move straight

¹ e.g. *νωθρός* as gloss in Hsch., *νωθής* in Σ here.

² O. Schneider thought that *σκαῖος* in 268 was used (like *σκάφος*) of the ship's hull, and certainly it is not clear why N. should distinguish ship and dinghy. Perhaps he is thinking of the discontinuity of movement in the cerastes.

³ This type of movement is conditioned by the surface over which the snake is progressing, and does not seem very suitable to the rocky slopes which, according to N., the haemorrhoids frequents. Philum. 21 expressly says that it moves straight forward, and differs from N. as to its coloration. Gossen-Steier (*RE* ii A 522) suggested *Vipera latastei*, but the habitat of this

snake (Spain, Morocco, Algiers) seems adverse. The symptoms produced by its bite (to which it owes its name) do not help, for haemorrhage, haematemesis, and haematuria are common sequelae of snake-bite (Osler and McCrae, *System of Medicine*, i. 261).

⁴ R. L. Ditmars *Reptile Book* 461.

⁵ Crotaline or 'side-winding' movement is discussed by W. Mosauer in *Zool. Anz.* lxxix. 201, *Zool. Jahrb. (Abt. Zool. Physiol.)* lii. 205, *Science* lxxvi. 583, and by J. Gray in *J. Exp. Biol.* xxiii. 113. The first of these papers contains photographs of a cerastes in motion, and of its track.

forward.¹ N. comes out of the test with considerable credit, and I have thought it worth while to emphasize the point since his insufferable style and the fabulous character of some of the creatures he mentions may blind one to the fact that the source he follows (generally agreed to be Apollodorus *περὶ θηρίων*)² must have contained some very acute observations. As another I should point to the mention in *Th.* 184 of the fold of mucous membrane at the base of a snake's poison-fang,³ and I should be surprised if a competent reader did not find a good many more.

Th. 367

ἀλλ' ὅταν ὄδωρ

σεῖριος ἀήνησι, τρύγη δ' ἐν πυθμένι λίμνης . . .

ἀήνησι Π ἀζήν- cett. ἐν PGM ἐνὶ cett.

According to Σ *τρύγη* here means *ξηρασία*, though the ordinary sense *crop* or *harvest* would serve as well. But Hsch. *ἐτρυνεν· ἐξηράνθη, ἐπὶ λίμνης, and τρυγεῖ· ξηραίνει*, Theognost., *An. Ox.* 2. 24 *τρύγει· ξηραίνει*, Zonar. *τρύγει· ξηραίνεται*, are some temptation to write *τρύγη* (or *-ῆ*) . . . *λίμνη*, for the absence of the copula seems awkward, and with *ὅταν* in the previous clause it might be rash to introduce *ἐν*. J. G. Schneider proposed *ἀζήνησ'*, *ἐτρύγη*, and Meineke, apparently independently, *ἐτρύγη* in Hesychius; but in N. the aor. ind. is open to the same objection as *ἐν*,⁴ and elision at this point in the verse, though not unexampled in N., is decidedly rare.⁵

Th. 618

πάντα δὲ λίγδω θρύπτε καὶ ἐν σκαφίδεσσι δοχαῖαις
φαρμάσσων μέθυ κείνο χοδὸς δεκάτη ἐνὶ μοίρῃ.

Πάντα are a number of simples just described, and editors print these lines with no visible signs of disquiet except that J. G. Schneider said *in voce κείνο haereo, eamque vitiosam esse suspicor*. He might well stick, for even if wine had previously been mentioned (as it has not) and *κείνο* were intelligible, I do not see how the lines could be construed. It is possible that something has fallen out after 618, but more probable, I think, that *κείνο* has displaced an imperative meaning *steep—medicate—wine by steeping your herbs in half a pint of it*. N. uses *χραίνω* in this sense,⁶ but I admit that *χραῖνε* is not very like *κείνο*.

Th. 640

ἡ δ' ἐτέρη πετάλοισι καὶ ἐν καυλοῖσι θάλαια

ὕψηλή, ὀλίγῳ δὲ περίξ καλχαίνεται ἄνθει·

βλάστη δ' ὡς ἔχιος σφεδανὸν δ' ἐφύπερθε κάρηαρ.

N. is talking of two varieties of a plant called in 637 (and 65) *ἐχίειον*, in 541 *ἐχis*, and by others *ἐχιον*; *ἡ* in 640 is apparently *ρίζα*: and since the plant cannot be compared to itself, *ἐχis* in 642 must mean *viper*, and the obvious way of translating—*its shoot resembles that of the ἐχis, and its head, etc.*—is barred. Moreover Dioscorides (4. 27), describing *ἐχιον*, says *τὰ δ' ἄνθη παρὰ τὰ φύλλα πορφυροειδῆ, ἐν οἷς ἐστὶν ὁ καρπὸς ἔχεις κεφαλῇ ὅμοιος*. I cannot however construe 642 plausibly even with the help of the commas placed by OSch. after *ἐχιος* and *ἐφύπερθε*, and according to Dioscorides it is

¹ Lucan (9. 716) does better—*spinaque uagi torquente cerastae*.

² And in *Al.* *περὶ θανασίμων φαρμάκων*. But I think it may have been too hastily assumed that he follows only one. Among remedies for hemlock-poisoning unmixed wine is recommended at *Al.* 195 and again at 198 as though N. had there turned to his second manual. The same explanation would serve for the double mention of *καυκαλίδες* in *Th.* 843, 892 which drove O. Schneider to emendation, and of resin at *Al.* 546, 554, which caused J. G. Schneider to excise,

and it would not be surprising if the subdivisions in N.'s lists of remedies (see p. 117, n. 1 below) sometimes at any rate indicated a change of authority.

³ For its function see Noguchi *Snake Venoms* 59.

⁴ At *Al.* 278 OSch. wrote *ὄφρ' ἂν ἐπὶ στυφόν τι ποτῶ* for *ἐπιστύφοντι*, but if this is right in principle I should go a step farther and prefer *ἐπῆ*.

⁵ Cf. *Diss. Vind.* vi. 67².

⁶ *Al.* 155, 531, 553.

the καρ
it grows

The
and the
σφιγκτό
Botany
acumin
portrai

I put th
about t
means
suitabl
π. agre
at any
discre
less dis
tached
show o

Des
This id
to othe
in The
Th. 529
fr. 70.
Αἰδεω
'Some
ὄρνυτ'
are of
haps t
meado
βαθεῖ
that if
I d
of the
be mu
πισύρω

¹ Un

² Bu

the *καρπός* not the *βλόστη* which is viperish. I suggest that we should write *βλαστει*—*it grows a head like that of a viper but σφεδαρός on top*.

The plant owes its name to the supposed resemblance of its seeds to snakes' heads, and the usual meaning of *σφεδαρός* is inappropriate. Σ say *τραχὺ καὶ σκληρόν καὶ σφικτόν*, of which the first is presumably right. I learn from Sowerby's *English Botany*³, vii. 89 f., that the seeds of *Echium vulgare* and *E. plantaginaceum* are 'angular, acuminate, olive brown, very rugose', and the rugosities may be studied in the portrait of one on pl. 1096.

Al. 55 πολλάκι δ' ἡμιδαῖς χειρὸς βάρους αἴνυσο θρίων
παῦρα χαμαιπίτυος.

144 ἡὲ μελισσάων καμάτῳ ἔνι παῦρα μορύξαις
σκορπιόεντα χαδὼν ψαθυρῆς ἐκ ρίζεα γαίης.

239 ῥοδέης θυόνεν μαλλοῖσιν ἀφύσσων
παῦρα λίπος στάξειας ἀνοιγομένοις στομάτεσσιν.

I put these passages here rather than in I because though L. s.v. *παῦρος* says nothing about them I do not know what it ought to say. Elsewhere (Hes. *Th.* 780) *παῦρα* means *seldom*, which it plainly does not here. *Gradually or little by little* would be suitable in 240, and also in 144 (where it is possible, though I think unlikely, that π. agrees with *ρίζεα*), but not in 56, where, as the context shows, *αἴνυσο* does not (or at any rate should not) mean *consume*, but *get for your patient*. All the interpreters discreetly skip the word in the three passages, and are, I presume, baffled—as, though less discreet, I am myself. I should like also to know what meaning should be attached to the word *ἄλις* which N. strews up and down Al. I can sometimes make a show of construing it, but at 23, 483, 499 (at any rate) it is hard work.

Al. 197 ἡὲ σύ γε κλυστήρος ἐνείης ὀπλίξειο τεύχος.

Despite the moods and tenses *having prepared, insert, not having inserted, prepare*. This idiom, in which verb and participle as it were change places, may be familiar to others, but it was not so to me, and as I have written an ignorant note on a specimen in Theoc. 25. 203 I venture to call attention to it here. There is another example in *Th.* 529 *ρίζαν ἔλεν γυιαλθέα θάμνον | σμώξας*, others in *Th.* 581 f., 601 f.¹, 935, and perhaps *fr.* 70. 15; and Dr. Maas, who explained Al. 197 to me, pointed out Theogn. 1124 *Ἰδὼεω μέγα δῶμ' ἤλυθεν ἐξαναδύς*.² Still more may be picked out of Platt's paper, 'Some Homeric Aorist Participles' in *J. Phil.* xxxv. 128, which starts from *Od.* 2. 2 *ὄρνυτ' ἄρ' ἐξ εὐνήφιν Ὀδυσσῆος φίλος υἱός | εἴματα ἐσάμενος*, though not all his examples are of this nature nor does it seem sufficient to call these participles 'timeless'. Perhaps this construction may explain *Th.* 418 f., where the *δρυῖνας*, driven from the meadows by the gadfly, *κατὰ πρέμνον κοίλης ὑπεδύσατο φηγοῦ | ὄξυς ἀλείς, κοῖτον δὲ βαθεὶ ἐνεδείματο θάμνῳ*—*eagerly enters a hollow oak and coils itself up*. I confess however that if I saw any means of doing so I should prefer to construe *ὄξυς ἀλείς* together.

I do not know whether the same exchange of function is possible when the tense of the participle is present, but I remark that a highly obscure prescription would be much less so if at *Th.* 709 *ἦς ἐπὶ δὴ τέρσαιο διατρυφὲς αἶμα κεδάσσας | δραχμῶν πισῶραν μίσγων βάρους* we might assume the sense to be *τεροσάμενος μίσγω*.

Al. 415 μὴ δὲ σνοσκνάμῃ τις αἰδρήεντα κορέσκει
νηδύν, οἷά τε πολλὰ παρασφαλῆες τεύχονται,
ἡὲ νέον σπείρημα καὶ ἀμφέκρηνα κομάων
κοῦροι ἀπειπάμενοι ὀλοήν θ' ἔρηγδόνα γυῖων
ὀρθόποδες βαίνοντες ἀνευ σμυγροῖο τιθήνης.

¹ Unless *κεράσαιο* is preferred to *κέρσαιο*.

² Buchholz-Peppmüller translate unconvinc-

ingly aus des Hades Tiefe emporgetaucht, zu seinem geräumigen Palaste zurückkehrte.

- 420 ἡλοσύνη βρύκωσι κακανθήεντας δράμους
οἷα νέον βρωτήρας ὑπὸ γναθμοῖσιν ὀδόντας
φαίνοντες, τότε κνηθμός ἐνοιδέα δάμναται οὐλα.
τῷ δ' ὅτε μὲν γλάγεος καθαρήν πόσιν ἄλθεα πώμοις.
423 ἄλθεα πώμοις Π: ἤλιθα πίνειν cett.

J. G. Schneider, taking exception to βρύκωσι, said that you could read βρύκοντες but that it was preferable to suppose a line containing *εταν* lost before 420. He also supposed lost after 420 a description of symptoms resulting from henbane-poisoning, and since Σ and Eutecnus say that the result is irritation of the gums, thought that in 421 f. this was compared to that produced by teething. Σ and Eutecnus however seem to be struggling with the existing text,¹ and it is hardly plausible to separate the infants in 417 ff. from those in 421 f. O. Schneider marked no lacunae, left βρύκωσι without explaining how it was to be construed, and altered οἷα in 421 to ἤέ, thus providing folly and itching gums as alternative reasons why children may eat henbane. It seems to me however that if we write βρύκουσι the resulting sentence, though lop-sided, is not unduly so for a poet who counts disbalance an ornament—do not in ignorance eat henbane, as some do by accident, or as children chew it innocently because they are cutting their teeth, at which time the gums itch. It is true that according to N.'s practice a description of symptoms might be expected, but the place for it is between 422 and 423.

At the end of 423 O. Schneider, for once deserting Π, printed ἤλιθα and left the last foot blank. But ἄλθος, known otherwise only to lexicographers, who gloss it φάρμακον, is just the word for N., who has ἀλθέω, ἐπαλθέω, ἀλθαίνω, ἀλθήεις,² γυνί-, ἐν-, εὐ-, and δυσ-αλθής, and perhaps πίσαις will do as well as another to follow it. N., who is fond of ἐμπίσιω, has ἐμπίσαις in a similar context at *Al.* 519, and the phrase will resemble 350 πορέειν ἀλκτήρια νούσων.

- Al.* 452 δῆποτε δ' ἡ ροδέοιο νέον θύος εὐτριχι λήνει,
ὀχλίζων κυνόδοντα τότ' ἡμύουσι χαλινοῖς,
ἐνθλίβοις, μαλλὸν δὲ βαθὺν κεκορημένον ἔλκοις
455 ἡὲ καὶ ἱρινόεν τοτὲ δ' αὖ μορόεντος ἐλαΐης.

This treatment for a patient suffering from opium-poisoning leaves interpreters gasping. Both J. G. Schneider and Brenning omit 454 from their versions, and what Σ and Eutecnus do with it is not worth recording. To be brief, I think that in the interests of concinnity 455 should follow 452, that in 453 τότ' ἡμύουσι is not as Σ suppose a temporal conjunction and a finite verb, but an adverb marking an alternative (as *τοτέ* does in 455 and very often elsewhere) and a participle, and that in 454 we should write ἔλκοι—'force the teeth open or when the jaws are parted,³ by means of a flock of wool smear with rose or iris or olive oil and let the patient drain a thick tuft saturated with it'—ἔλκειν being used as with *δέπας* or *μάστον*. The grammatically disparate alternatives in 453 are like those in 452, 455, and disbalance, as I have already said, is a favourite trick of N.'s. In opium-poisoning the jaw-muscles are relaxed (as indeed N. has just told us in 439) and the position of the jaw in 453 will depend on the posture of the patient. The meaning of *μορόεις* I have discussed above (p. 104).

Al. 567-93

N., whose mind is less disorderly than his style (or, it may be, who follows an authority more lucid than himself), adopts in *Al.* a regular pattern for each section.

¹ According to Dsc. 4. 68 the plant is *μανιώδης* and *καρωτικός*. He says nothing about itching gums.

² *Th.* 84; but at 645 also cited by L. *ἀνθήεις* seems more probable.

³ καὶ εἰμύουσι BPR³ χαλινοῦς MR, variants in MSS. of the common class, might lend colour to καί, εἰ μύουσι, χαλινοῦς—'and the lips, if closed'. But in this poet the easier is not apt to be the better reading.

The pois
are follow
principle
θερόεις th
certain
δ γ' ἀφθα
with em
is not p
second, l
tion of t
to keep
573-7 to
stantly
common
transpos
unparall
on toads

The par
fungus-p
themsel
against
seems h
sense of
though
recorde

20 βλαστο
23 μέσφα

The cor
a good
ἐχυρῶ
Schneid
propag
and pla
united
be star
phrastu

Sinc

¹ *Al.*
Similarl

The poison is named and perhaps described, the symptoms are enumerated, and they are followed by antidotes; but in this paragraph, which is too long to set out here, the principle is abandoned. Its contents are as follows. 567 two kinds of toad, one *θερόεις* the other *κωφός*, may be sources of poison; 570 *τῶν ἡτοῖ θερόεις μὲν* produces certain symptoms; 573 you should administer such-and-such remedies; 578 *αὐτὰρ ὁ γ' ἀφθογγος* produces other (not dissimilar) symptoms; 584 *ναὶ μὴν* you should treat with emetics, dry heat, and other things. It is probably not demonstrable that N. is not prescribing one set of remedies against the first toad and others against the second, but I think that anyone familiar with N. will be made uneasy by this disposition of themes, and since the toads were mentioned together to begin with, will want to keep them and the remedies together throughout—in other words to transfer 573–7 to follow 583. His suspicions will be confirmed by *ναὶ μὴν*, which N. uses constantly to subdivide a single theme, not to mark the transition to another. Most commonly it adds a further group of remedies to a first,¹ as it will if the lines are transposed; as they stand *ναὶ μὴν* marks a transition from symptoms to cures, a use unparalleled in N. and so far as I know elsewhere.² [Diosc.] *Alex.* 31 is much briefer on toads, but I should judge him to have read the lines in the order here proposed.

Al. 616 καὶ τὰ μὲν οὖν Νικάνδρος ἔῃ ἐνικάτθετο βίβλῳ
μοχθήεντα μύκητα παρ' ἀνέρι φαρμακόντα.
πρὸς δ' ἔτι τοῖς κ.τ.λ.

The paragraph beginning thus, which is no doubt spurious, adds one remedy for fungus-poisoning to those supplied by N. in 527 ff. but makes no mention of the fungi themselves. The lines must therefore mean 'some remedies medicinal for a man against noxious fungi N. set down in his book. But in addition to those' etc. It seems however more probable that the author wrote *φαρμακόντα* with an unusual sense of the verb than that he used an adj. to govern the accusative. Incidentally, though *τά* is not in agreement with *μύκητα*, I should guess the latter to be an unrecorded heteroclite n.pl. rather than a collective sing.

Fr. 74. 20 βλαστοδρεπιδεχυτοιο καὶ εἰς μίαν ὄρσοο κόρσην,
σπείραν ὑπὸ σπυρίδεσσι νεοπλέκτοισι καθάπτων,
ὄφρα δύο κροκόωντες ἐπιζυγόντε κόρυμβοι
μέσφα συνωρίζωσιν ὑπερβιάλοιο μετώπου.

20 βλαστοδρεπή δ' ἔχυρῳ Wilamowitz ὄρσοο J G Sch. ὄρσοο A. 22 κόρυμβοι Canter -βοις A
23 μέσφα Meineke μέσσα A.

The corrections printed in my text seem right, and Wilamowitz's suggestion in 20 a good deal better than its predecessors, though I do not understand why he wrote *ἔχυρῳ* rather than *-οῖο*. I am concerned however only with 21, which neither the Schneiders nor the editors of Athenaeus appear to understand. This is a method of propagating ivy—'combine the two shoots into a single head, twisting them together and planting them in newly plaited baskets in order that the yellow clusters may be united and linked together up to their flaunting crown'. The twisted shoots are to be started in baskets of earth and presently planted out, baskets and all, as Theophrastus (*C.P.* 5. 6. 6: cf. [Arist.] *Prob.* 924^b10) recommends for cucumbers.

Fr. 74. 40 ἔρπυλλον δὲ φριαλευσοτεν βάλουσι φυτεύσεις,
ὄφρα κλάδοις μακροῖσιν ἐφερπύζων διάηται
ἢ κατακρεμάσῃν ἐφιμείρων ποτὰ Νυμφῶων.

Since planting your thyme on βάλουσι will not particularly expose it to wind or

¹ *Al.* 64, 178, 554, *Th.* 51, 66, 76, 520, 863, 896, 921. trial, and *Th.* 145, 334 further varieties of snake.
Similarly *Th.* 822 adding marine pests to terres- ² On *ναὶ μὴν* see *Lehrs Quaest. Ep.* 322.

water, this word, as well as what precedes, must be corrupt. Merkel proposed *ἐν φρικαλέοις βουνοῖσι*, importing a suitable noun but an unsuitable adjective and an unusual rhythm;¹ and O. Schneider's *ἐφ' ὑδροῖσιν ἐπ' ἀμβώνεσσι* mended these at the expense of the noun. Both assumed N. to be recommending one site for the bed, and Schneider pinned this purpose on N. by writing *ἡδέ* in 42. I should have thought that he was recommending either a windy position or else one within reach of water, and since he often uses *ὅτε* like *τότε* and *πολλάκι* to introduce an alternative, I should decipher *ὅτ' ἐν* with some confidence. The nouns must remain less certain, but I suggest *ἐρπυλλον δ' ὀφρύεσσιν, ὅτ' ἐν βουνοῖσι, φυτεύσεις*. *Ὀφρύς* is not rare of an abrupt bank to river or ditch, which is precisely the sense required—'plant your thyme on brinks or on hillocks'. The respective advantages of the two sites are then given in chiasitic order. For the preposition attending only the second of the two nouns it governs see *Th.* 261, 393, 762, 893, *Al.* 181, and perhaps *Fr.* 70. 4.

TRINITY COLLEGE, CAMBRIDGE.

A. S. F. GOW.

¹ *Th.* 894 is the sole example in N. of a line with hephthemimeral caesura only.

I AM n
lyric p
of text
propo
largely
the pr
howev
ground
ready
Of
in the
Ἄνδρ'
find re
type.
frs. 23
least i
is very

The en
none o
ides, p
οὔτε,

The c
It is
stand
lines
paral
on th

THE METRICAL UNITS OF GREEK LYRIC VERSE. III

6

I AM not proposing in this essay to treat at length and in detail of the metric of other lyric poets. In most cases questions of metre are intimately involved with questions of text, into which so many other considerations enter that in dealing with them proportion would be lost, while metrical analysis of such material would still remain largely speculative. What follows is therefore little more than a general account of the principles of composition which these poets appear to me to follow; I have, however, indicated a few passages where emendations made purely on metrical grounds and widely accepted seem to me, in the absence of responsion, based on too ready a desire to reduce all poems to the best-known formulas of versification.

Of the great names, only Simonides and Bacchylides seem to compose habitually in the free periodic style like Pindar. The longest fragments of the former, the *Ἄνδρ' ἀγαθὸν μὲν* and the *Danae*, however reconstructed (and I regard the attempt to find responsion in the latter as to say the least unconvincing), are undoubtedly of this type. It is interesting to find him writing, besides regular dactylo-epitrite (as in frs. 23, 57 D²), a sort of near dactylo-epitrite, using all the rarer variants, so that, at least in the small fragments we possess, the borderline between this metre and others is very indistinct. Thus fr. 48 D² is very nearly regular:

<i>τίς κεν αἰνήσει νόψ πίπυνος Λίνδου ναέταν Κλεόβουλον</i>	s - dd - dd -
<i>ἀεναίους ποταμοῖς¹ ἄνθεσ' τ' εἰλινοῖς</i>	dd ' dd
<i>ἁελίου τε φλογὶ χρυσέας τε σελάνας</i>	dd - d -
<i>καὶ θαλασσαιῶσι δύναις ἀντιθένα μένος στάλας ;</i>	s - s - sdš
<i>ἅπαντα γάρ ἐστι θεῶν ἥσσω· λίθον δέ</i>	υ dd - s υ
<i>καὶ βρότεοι παλάμαι θραύοντι, μωροῦ φωτὸς ἄδε βουλά.</i>	dd - s - ss -

The encomium on the dead at Thermopylae (fr. 5 D².) is slightly more irregular in type; none of the emendations required to convert it to strictness (*v. Wil. Sappho u. Simonides*, p. 140, n. 3) is very difficult, but none is necessary, except for the deletion of the *οὔτε*, which as Wilamowitz justly says is a matter of style as well as metre:

<i>τῶν ἐν Θερμοπύλαις θανόντων</i>	šds -
<i>εὐκλεῆς μὲν ἂ τύχα, καλὸς δ' ὁ πότμος,</i>	s υ s υ s -
<i>βωμὸς δ' ὁ τάφος, πρὸ γόνων δὲ μῆστις, ὁ δ' οἶκτος ἔπαυος.</i>	- dd - dd υ
<i>ἐντάφιον δὲ τοιοῦτον εὐρώς</i>	dds -
<i>οὐθ' ὁ πανδαμάτωρ ἀμαυρώσει χρόνος</i>	sds - s
<i>ἀνδρῶν ἀγαθῶν, ὁ δὲ σηκὸς οἰκέταν εὐδοξίαν</i>	- dd υ s - s
<i>Ἑλλάδος εἴλετο· μαρτυρεῖ δὲ Λεωνίδας</i>	dd υ ds
<i>ὁ Σπάρτας βασιλεὺς, ἀρετᾶς μέγαν λελοιπῶς</i>	šdd υ s -
<i>κόσμον ἀεναόν τε κλέος.</i>	sdd

The defence of the unusual rhythms is their echo, sds and šds, sdd and šdd, ds and dds. It is generally assumed that the first line begins in the middle of a period, but it stands perfectly well by itself, answered by *οὐθ' ὁ πανδαμάτωρ ἀμαυρώσει χρόνος* four lines later. *εὐρώς* stands badly at the beginning of the following line; it is claimed as a parallel to *στάλας* in the fragment quoted above, but the parallel only works of course on the usual assumption that each is a 'spondee', i.e. - Λ - Λ . If my interpretation of

¹ Possibly we should read *ποταμοῖσιν*, dd υ dd.

these as 'drag' is correct, *εὐρὼς οὐθ' ὁ π. ἀ. χ.* would give a drag in a single *s* unit (- *u* -) and I know of no parallel to this. Simonides uses drag very frequently in the surviving fragments.

A further stage away from dactylo-epitrite is seen in such fragments as 30:

δίδωτι δ' εὐχος Ἑρμῆς ἐναγώνιος	~ ss' ds
Μαιᾶδος οὐρείας ἑλικοβλεφάρου παῖς· ἔτικτε δ' Ἄτλας	d - dd' ss -
ἐπτά ἰοπλοκάμων φιλᾶν θυγατρῶν τάν γ' ἔζοχον εἶδος,	dd ~ d - d -
ταῖ καλέονται Πελεΐδες οὐράνιοι.	d' sdd

Here only the relative frequency of *dd* and link-*anceps* survive. The latter persists to a degree quite unfamiliar in the 'aeolic' of Pindar, even in fragments like 32 and 37 which have severed all other connexion with dactylo-epitrite:

32	ὃς δουρὶ πάντας	- s -
	νίκασε νέους δινάεντα βαλὼν	- d - d
	Ἄναυρον ὑπὲρ πολυβότρυος ἐξ Ἴωλκοῦ·	~ ddds -
	οὕτω γὰρ Ὀμηρος ἦδ' Ὀμηροῦτος αἶεσε λαοῖς.	- ds - s' ~ s -

Thus it appears that in Simonides the distinction of metrical types is less clear-cut than in Pindar. Bacchylides also softens the transition, though differently, by way of his 'dactylo-iambics', as they are often called: that is to say, a rhythm which combines *dd* units with single-short of various lengths (not reducible to metra) and also with mixed *d* and *s*, using only short *anceps* for link-syllable, so that analysis is slightly uncertain. The only poem of any length that survives in this type is the dithyramb 19 Sn., which contains a single triad, the second half being mutilated. Where the evidence of responson reaches, Bacchylides seems to have followed his usual practice (noted in Part I, p. 145) of making his diaereses either just before or just after link-*anceps*; at least they either coincide in strophe and antistrophe or fall within one short syllable of each other, so that there is some justification for looking for link-*anceps* at this point.

I	πάρεστι μυρία κέλυσος ἀμβροσίῳ μελέων	~ sss ~ dd
19	ὄτ' Ἄργον ὄμμασι βλέποντα πάντοθεν ἀκαμάτοισ	
	ὃς ἂν παρὰ Πιερίδων λάχῃσι δῶρα Μουσᾶν,	~ dd ~ ss -
	μεγιστόανασσα κέλευσε χρυσόπεπλος Ἥρα	
	ἰοβλέφαροί τε θεαὶ ¹ φερεστέφανοι Χάριτες	~ dd ~ dd ~ ss -
	ἀκοιτον ἄνπνον ἑόντα καλλικέραν δάμαλιν	
	βάλωσιν ἀμφὶ τιμάν	
	φύλασεν οὐδὲ Μαίας	
	ὑμνοῖσιν· ὕφαινε νῦν ἐν τοῖς πολυηράτοις τι καὶνὸν	- dd' dss ~ ss
	υἱὸς δύναιτ' οὔτε κατ' εὐφειγέας ἀμέρας λαθεῖν νῦν	
	ὀλβίαις Ἀθάναις,	
	οὔτε νύκτας ἀγνάς.	
	ἐνδύνετε Κηῖα μέριμνα	- dss ~
	εἴτ' οὖν γένετ' - - - -	
	πρέπει σε φερτάταν ἵμεν	~ sss
	ποδαρκέ' ἄγγελον Διὸς	
	ὁδὸν παρὰ Καλλιόπας λαχοῖσαν ἔζοχον γέρας	~ dd ~ sss
	κτανεῖν τότε Γᾶς - - - ὀβριμοσπόρου λίθω	

¹ So Maas for καί.

†τί ἦν, † Ἄργος ὅθ' ἔπιον λιποῦσα φεύγε χρυσέα βούς	sdss ∪ ss -
Ἄργον· ἦ ῥα καὶ ----- ἄσπετοι μέριμναι·	
εὐρυσθενέος φραδαῖσι φερτάτου Διός	- ds ∪ ss
ἦ Πιερίδες φύτευσαν -----	
Ἰνάχου ῥοδοδάκτυλος κόρα ;	sdss
καδέων ἀνάπαισιν -----	

It should be noted that the fifth and sixth periods cannot be run into one, except by scanning μέριμνᾱ πρέπει, which gives units unlike those of the context.

Bacchylides' encomium in the Lesbian style (fr. 20 b Sn.) has already been quoted; his third epinician, though triadic in form, has its 3-period stanzas composed in much the same manner. Fr. 6 D² of Simonides, a θρήνος of which 4 lines are quoted by Favorinus ap. Stob., again recalls the Lesbians, though we cannot tell whether this is a complete stanza:

ἄνθρωπος ἐὼν μή ποτε φάσῃς, ὅ τι γίνεται αὔριον,	- d d dds
μήδ' ἄνδρα ἰδὼν ὄλβιον, ὅσπον χρόνον ἔσσεται·	- d d ds
ὥκεια γὰρ οὐδὲ τανυπτερόγυ μνίας	- dds
οὕτως ἂ μετᾴστασις.	sss

Nothing is here in need of emendation, for either sense or metre. The similarity of the first two lines to the 'asclepiad' metres of Alcaeus and Sappho is obvious, though instead of the dissyllabic 'basis' there is here a single *anceps*. Drag is introduced into the last two lines.

Periodic composition is of all kinds the most difficult to attribute with certainty to a fragmentary text, and caution is particularly necessary when the less mutilated relics of a lyric poet's text belong to a different type. It is very doubtful whether any of Alcman or Ibycus can properly be called periodic; the text and prosody of the former's εὐθουσιν δ' ὀρέων are so uncertain that I can come to no conclusion about it, and although his fr. 43 D² might be dactylo-epitrite it is too short for argument. Certainly where enough survives for diagnosis their poems are clearly composed in cola, like the choruses of drama. The famous Partheneion of Alcman is written in stanzas of three sections *abc*, *a* being 8 lines of alternate trochaic dimeters catalectic and enoplians of the form ∪-∪-∪-∪-∪-, *b* all trochaic (2 trims. + 2 dims.), *c* dactylic (tetram. + tetram. cat.). Its most extraordinary feature is the free resposion in the clausula, the last line being either - ∪-∪-∪-∪-∪- or - ∪-∪-∪-∪-∪-¹. Alcman, in fact, applies here a principle of resposion by syllable-counting (the number of syllables corresponds though the quantities change), traces of which are to be seen in drama, especially comedy,² though never as here in a clausula. The cola of section *a* are each separate periods, admitting *brevis in longo* and hiatus at line-end; in *b* the trimeters are periods but the dimeters uncertain (they may in fact be a single tetrameter); the dactyls in *c* run on in synaphea:

Δαμαρέτα τ' ἐρατά τε Ἰανθεμῖς,	- ∪-∪-∪-∪-∪-∪-
ἀλλ' Ἀγησιχόρα με τηρεῖ.	- ∪-∪-∪-∪-∪-

This dactylic tetrameter is a favourite of Alcman; there are several fragments entirely composed in it, though unfortunately the evidence is nowhere really decisive as to the extent of synaphea (where the close is spondaic; final - ∪ ∪ is of course in obligatory synaphea). It seems to me on the whole most likely that Alcman composed

¹ In the second line the short second syllable of Ἐνερικός l. 51 can, as Maas points out, be accounted simply a special licence in an un-

hellenic proper name.

² See my *Lyric Metres of Greek Drama*, ch. iv.

his dactyls in 'systems', that is to say with regular diaeresis but in synaphea, like the anapaestic systems of drama. We do not know how he let them run out—what sort of colon, that is, corresponded to the paroemiac of anapaests. It is tempting to suppose that the curious clausula of the Partheneion, — — — — — — — — — —, was his normal way of closing a system; possibly the last line of fr. 37 gives a longer version of this, but the text is uncertain.

Ibycus' manner of composition is somewhat similar, so far as we can judge. Of his most famous song (fr. 6 D².) from which the 'ibycean' — — — — — — — — — — takes its name only the first few lines provide a reasonably safe basis for analysis:

ἦρι μὲν αἶ τε Κυδώνια
μαλίδες ἀρδόμεναι ῥοᾶν
ἐκ ποταμῶν, ἵνα Παρθένων
κᾶπος ἀκήρατος, αἶ τ' οἶνανθίδες
αὐξόμεναι σκιεροῖσιν ὑφ' ἔρνεσιν
οἶναρέοις θαλέθοισιν. ἐμοὶ δ' ἔρος
οὐδεμίαν κατάκοιτος ὥραν.

Three ibyceans are followed by three dactylic tetrameters which run out in an 'alcaic decasyllable' — — — — — — — — — —, in effect a pendant form of ibycean. Probably all these seven lines are in synaphea; the last four at least are. The song addressed to Polycrates is in stanzas composed in *aabc*.

a — — — — — — — — — —
— — — — — — — — — —
— — — — — — — — — —

The dactyls in synaphea again run out in single-short, as in one version of the clausula of Alcman's Partheneion. *b* has three paroemiacs — — — — — — — — — —, the last ending in *anceps*, and *c* two unusual lines

Πέρραμον δ' ἀνέβα ταλαπείριον ἄτα — — — — — — — — — —
χρυσόθειραν διὰ Κυπρίδα — — — — — — — — — —

which are reminiscent of Lesbian rhythms. Here is a technique familiar from many odes in drama: little groups of similar cola in synaphea, forming, not a single 'Vers' or what I have in this essay called 'period',¹ but a section of a whole stanza, a 'major period', as I have elsewhere called it; where the rhythm changes synaphea is broken.

Metre is a very unreliable clue for determining whether a poem was written for solo or choral performance. In general it seems to be the case that verse composed in a metron-series *κατὰ στίχον* (i.e. in unvarying lengths, with pause at the end of each line) was declaimed or given in solo-recitative, with the possible exception of ionics, since Hephaestion 12 refers to ὅλα ἄσματα ἰωνικά by Alcman, Sappho, and Alcaeus, some of which may have been of such regular form; we do not, however, know enough about the distinction between *ᾠδή* and *παρακαταλογία* (nor even whether recitative was all of one kind) to be sure of this. Other rhythms repeating *κατὰ στίχον* but not in metron-series hover a little uncertainly between recitative and monody, and probably varied as between one poet or group of poets and another; the dicola and tricola of Archilochus, for instance, may have been given in recitative and the Lesbian stichic rhythms sung in just the same manner as the non-stichic, but there is really no evidence as to whether the use of voice and lyre was the same or different in Sappho's hexameters, her *ἡράμαν μὲν ἔγω . . .*, and her *φαίνεται μοι . . .*, and it is very doubtful

¹ 'Minor period' in my *Lyric Metres of Greek Drama*.

whether Hephaestion or his sources knew either. At least it seems to be true that rhythms *κατὰ στίχον* were never sung in chorus, though in drama they could be given in choral recitative. Triadic composition, of course, implies a chorus, and the full periodic style of composition, whether triadic or monostrophic, was almost always choral, though the bizarre exception of Timocreon's lampoon on Themistocles reminds us that dactylo-epitrite, at least, could go into circulation in a sort of skolon form. But it is the large intermediate class of poems constructed, so to speak, *κατὰ κῶλον*, shading off on the one side into periodic, on the other into stichic, that prevents any categorical division by metrical form into choral lyric and monody; moreover, some lines of Lesbian monody, or of Anacreon, are in isolation so like periodic as to warn us against making deductions from fragments. Most poets were composers of either monody or choral lyric, not of both, but where tradition is not clear on this point we have to rely for the distinction on considerations of subject-matter and style; where these are not decisive, as in the case of all the extant Ibycus and some of Alcman, metrical structure is no guide. Metrically, as we have seen, these two are much nearer to the choruses of drama than to any other choral lyric; but like the dramatic poets they sometimes show affinities with Lesbian monody and Anacreon.

Anacreon, in fact, in his use of aeolo-choriambic often anticipates the simpler stanzas of drama, especially of comedy. His first book consists of poems written in short glyconic 'systems' of two, three, or four cola running out in a catalectic colon (pherecratean). He also has systems, of varied length, of iono-anacreontic dimeters, trimeters, and tetrameters which sometimes at least have no special clausula. He seems to have used a variety of dicola, sometimes a full + a catalectic form, sometimes two dissimilar cola like Archilochus, *κατὰ στίχον*. The lines of mixed double and single-short reminiscent of Lesbian rhythms, though rarely quite the same in detail, and others very like the rhythm of skolia, may also have been composed *κατὰ στίχον*, but the disjointed fragments give us no direct evidence. Once, in 54 D², he arranges tricola (iambo-choriambic tetrameter ending in *anceps*, iambo-choriambic tetram. + iamb. dim.) in a string of little stanzas. This is the nearest approach in the extant fragments to strophic responsion, except in the sense that a short poem such as 5 D², which is probably complete may consist of two little systems of equal length—here 3 full cola + 1 catalectic. Within the systems one colon may stand in anaclastic responsions to another: thus $\cup\cup-\frac{x}{x}\cup\cup--$ is treated as the equivalent of $\cup\cup-\frac{x}{x}\cup\cup--$, and in 39 (whether these 'trimeters' are in a system or *κατὰ στίχον*) we get

$\cup\cup--\cup\cup--\cup\cup--$
 $\cup\cup--\cup\cup--\cup\cup--$
 $\cup\cup--\cup\cup--\cup\cup--$

Similarly in the iambo-choriambics of 54 $\frac{x}{x}\cup\cup--$ is several times treated as interchangeable with $\frac{x}{x}\cup\cup--$.

Short systems of five or six cola, the clausula being modified to give some contrasting rhythm, are all we can deduce with certainty from the fragments of Corinna. These are either ionic dimeters, often with colon-caesura, running out in a curiously prolonged clausula, as in the Strife of Cithaeron and Helicon:

μεγάλαν τ' ἀθανάτων ἔξ- $\cup\cup--\cup\cup--$
 -ελε τιμάν." τὰδ' ἔμελψεμ.
 μάκαρας δ' αὐτίκα Μώση
 φερέμεν ψᾶφον ἔταπτον
 κρουφίαν κἀλπίδας ἐν χρο-
 -σοφαῖς. τὺ δ' ἄμα πάντες ὄρθεν, $\cup\cup--\cup\cup--$

or, in the Asopides, 'choriambic dimeters' of the form $\frac{x}{x}\cup\cup--\cup\cup--$ (with occasional

resolution of one of the first two syllables) mixed with glyconics and running out in a pherecratean:

τόδε γέρας κατῖσχον ἰὼν	υ υ υ - υ - υ υ -
ἐς πεντήκοντα κρατερῶν	- - - - - υ υ -
ὀμήμων, πέδοχος προφά-	υ - υ υ υ - υ -
-τας σεμνῶν ἀδούτων λαχῶν	- - - - - υ υ -
ἀψευδῖαν Ἀκρηφεῖν.	- - - - - υ - -

Corinna, it appears from this, allows an ordinary glyconic to respond with a choriambic dimeter by the same sort of anacasis (-υ-υ-υ-υ-υ-υ-=-υ-υ-υ-υ-υ-) as Anacreon's in his iono-anacreontics; and the tragedians occasionally adopt both these irregularities.

7

The lyric so far discussed has fallen into one or the other of two classes with a fairly clear line of demarcation: that constructed in periods, consisting of units juxtaposed or linked by *anceps*, and that constructed by cola (some of them analysable into metra) whether in homogeneous systems in synaphea or forming heterogeneous stanzas with frequent pause and change of rhythm. Pindar, Simonides, and Bacchylides are representative of the former, while dactylo-epitrite brings in a few other poems by little-known authors, and some of the odes of drama, though these tend to develop some of the balance and repetitive symmetry of colon-lyric. The second category includes the greater part of dramatic lyric, and the most intelligible of the fragments of Alcman, Ibycus, Anacreon, and Corinna. Stesichorus cannot be grouped with any certainty, and possibly his manner does not fully coincide with either of these two. There remain Alcaeus and Sappho and the skolia, and I have spoken of an occasional approximation to the Lesbian manner in fragments of some of the poets already mentioned. I have left this group to the last in defiance of chronology because it mixes some of the attributes of both periodic and colon-composition.

The types of metrical structure used by Sappho and Alcaeus (apart from dactylic hexameters or iambic tetrameters *κατὰ στίχον* with which I am not here concerned) are in general reducible to two: rhythms that extend by prolongation, and rhythms that extend by the addition of whole units with or without link-*anceps*. Extension can be measured by the number of syllables, since resolution is unknown in Lesbian lyric. Lines of either the prolonged or the compound type can repeat *κατὰ στίχον* or be combined (either type singly or mixed) into heterogeneous repeating stanzas of two, three, or four lines.

These two types are easily distinguishable; the prolonged rhythm has no juxtaposed longs or *anceps* in midline, whereas the compound rhythm has always one or both of these. Initial or final *anceps* or both may be added to either type. The *prolonged* may run wholly in double-short, or in mixed double and single, never wholly in single-short. It may change from single to double and back again, but once it has moved out of double-short it never changes back. The *compound* rhythm may contain either simple units -υ- and -υυ-, or prolonged units of the kind already described in § 2 and used in the Pindaric period. Either prolonged or compound rhythms may start with an 'aeolic base' of two syllables *ad lib.* υ υ, this base being unique in allowing υ υ to correspond to --. Such initial freedom is found only in Lesbian verse and one or two skolia.

The shortest lines are octosyllabic.¹ The 'glyconic', i.e. -υυ-υ-υ-υ- upon an

¹ I regard Sappho 135-6 D² as incapable of metrical arrangement as it stands; probably some words have been omitted. The worst of all shifts is to make a single line of κτῆ δ' ἀμβροσίας

μὲν κράτηρ ἐκέκρατο. Apart from the dubious quantity such a conjunction of two adoneans -υυ-υυ-|--υυ-υυ- is a metrical impossibility in any kind of verse at any time.

aeolic stanza
υ ds υ
ing the
tratio
accept

is a lon
στίχον.

Alc
taining

The fir
concei
beginn

The ae
is not
34 sho
dicol
tists)
Alcae
In
decase

I see n
two gl
as we
was el
which
(phal
Sapph
υ:-υ

is ano
each c
Oti
begin
into d
rhyth

¹ Th
rule, Sa
if eithe
slightly

aeolic base $\omega\omega$ is not used *κατὰ στίχον* but only combines with other rhythms into stanzas. The line formed by transferring the first syllable of a glyconic to the end $\omega ds \omega$ is found only in pseudo-Sappho 94 D². *δέδωκε μὲν ἃ σελάνα κτλ.*, four lines repeating the rhythm *κατὰ στίχον*. It is quoted without author by Hephaestion as an illustration of his conception of a 'major ionic dimeter', and aeolicized by editors who accept Stephanus' attribution to Sappho. Sappho 88

πλήρης μὲν ἐφαίνετ' ἃ σελάνα·
αἱ δ' ὥς περὶ βῶμον ἐστάθησαν

is a longer version of a similar rhythm, *dss* with *anceps* fore and aft, again used *κατὰ στίχον*.

Alcaeus 34 *ἐκ δὲ ποτήριον πῶνῃς Δινομένη παρίσδων* must be interpreted as containing a glyconic with final *anceps* added (hipponactean):

ἐκ δὲ ποτήριον ¹ *πῶνῃς Δινομένη παρίσδων* - - - - -

The first words, - - - - -, probably belong to the previous line, though this might conceivably be a long compound, of the type found in Sappho 97 and 98, a stanza beginning with

- - - | $\omega\omega$ - - - - -

The aeolic base is left on the glyconic even in mid-verse, except that the double-short is not allowed, since here in mid-verse it would transform the metrical type.¹ Alcaeus 34 should in no case be interpreted (as in Diehl) - - - - - | - - - - -. Such a dicolon formed by full + catalectic colon (as in Archilochus, Anacreon, or the dramatists) is not in the Lesbian manner, nor is tail-drag found elsewhere in Sappho or Alcaeus.

In 14 D². Alcaeus sets a complete glyconic *sds* on an aeolic base, thus making a decasyllable:

Ἀχιλλεύς, ὃ τᾶς Σκυθίκας μέδεις.

I see no reason to regard this as starting in the middle of a line or as a fragment of two glyconics with colon-caesura $\omega\omega$ - - - -] - - - - - - - - -. Such a decasyllable, as we have seen,² is found in Pindar and Bacchylides; doubtless Alcaeus' version was elsewhere capable of the variation - - - - - - - - - also. The hendecasyllable which forms the last line of the stanza in Sappho 97 and 98 $\omega\omega$: - - - - - - - : - ('phalaecean') is of similar form with the *d* shifted up and final *anceps* added, and Sappho 144 *a* and *b* adds initial *anceps* to the phalaecean to make a dodecasyllable ω : - - - - - - - - : - *Ψαπφοῦ, τί τὰν πολυόλβον Ἀφροδίταν*; Alcaeus 93

τριβώλετερ· οὐ γὰρ Ἀρκάδεσσι λῶβα ω : - - - - - - - - : -

is another dodecasyllable with the choriamb shifted up yet again. The root form in each of these cases is the decasyllable with one *d*.

Other rhythms of the prolonged types extend *d* to *dd*, *ddd*, or *dddd*. These all begin with the aeolic base and either end with a simple *anceps* or prolong the last *d* into *ds*. Thus if we take the glyconic $\omega\omega$: - - - - - as the shortest length of this rhythm, the next is the hendecasyllable of Sappho 137,

Ἔρος δῆυτε μ' ὁ λυσιμέλης δόνει $\omega\omega$: - - - - - - - -
γλυκύκικρον ἀμάχανον ὄρπετον $\omega\omega$: - - - - - - - -

¹ There are two apparent exceptions to this rule, Sapph. 98, l. 4 and Alc. 54, l. 5, but I doubt if either is admissible. The former is in any case slightly corrupt and the letters not quite cer-

tainly decipherable; in the latter, if some such form as Bergk's *κοίλαι* is not adopted, we should perhaps emend to *ποίκλαι* with Kaibel.

² *Supra*, Part II, p. 25, n. 1.

Sappho 124 θυρώρω πόδες ἐμπορόγυιοι has the simple final *anceps* $\times \times$ dd \times . The second book of her collected works is written in similar lines of fourteen syllables:

of which 121 ἡράμαν μὲν ἔγω σέθεν Ἄτθι πάλοι ποτά $\times \times$ dddd

ἦρος ἄγγελος ἱμερόφωνος ἀήδων

is the shorter form with final *anceps* $\times \times$ ddd \times . Alcaeus 99 has sixteen syllables:

κέλομαι τινα τὸν χαρίεντα Μένωνα κάλεσσαι, $\times \times$ dddd -
αἱ χρῆ συμποσίας ἐπ' ὄνασιν ἔμοι γε γένεσθαι

and this is the longest extant.

Of these two types of rhythm, the compound and the prolonged, the compound are the more frequent in Lesbian poetry. One common kind is formed by the juxtaposition of choriamb, which like the prolonged dd . . . rhythms just described usually start from an aeolic base and end either in ds or final *anceps*. These 'asclepiad' rhythms again start from the glyconic $\times \times$ ds and mount up by choriamb, that is to say by the insertion of complete units instead of by prolongation:

Alc. 43 (end of stanza) Φιττάκω δὲ δίδους κῦδος ἐπήρατον $\times \times$ d' ds
Sapph. 106 ὀφθαλμοῖς δὲ μέλαις νύκτος ἄωρος $\times \times$ d' d \times
Sapph. 57 βροδοπάχες ἀγναι Χάριτες, δεῦτε Δίος κόραι $\times \times$ d' d' d' ds

(The whole of Sappho's Bk. III was written in these κατὰ στίχον).

Sapph. 107 κατθνάσκει, Κυθήρη', ἄβρος Ἀδωνις· τί κε θείμεν; $\times \times$ d' d' d' \times
Alc. 15 Κρονίδα βασιλῆος γένος Αἴαν τὸν ἄριστον πεδ' Ἀχιλλέα $\times \times$ d' d' d' d' ds

Pseudo-Sappho 93 Κρήσσαι νύ ποτ' ὦδ' ἐμμελέως πόδεσσιν \times d' ds \times begins with *anceps* instead of aeolic base and adds final *anceps*; the papyrus fragments of Bk. IV show the same rhythm with an extra choriamb (Hephaestion's 'major ionics'):

σὺ δὲ στεφάνοις, ὦ Δίκα, πάρθεσθ' ἐράτοις φόβαισιν \times d' d' ds used κατὰ στίχον.

Sappho 90 drops both base and initial *anceps* and starts from d:

δηυτέ νυν ἄβραι Χάριτες καλλίκομοί τε Μοῖσαι d' d' ds -

If the text of Sappho 126 D². is to be trusted, the choriamb is there used not in juxtaposition but with link and final *anceps*:

σκιδναμένας ἐν στήθεσιν ὄργας d - d -
μαφυλάκαν γλῶσσαν πεφύλαχθαι

(The second line has been considerably doctored to bring it into conformity with the first.)

Much the most common single-short unit found in compound rhythms is the simple s - \times - \times . This is repeated in the 'alcaic enneasyllable': λαῖφος δὲ πὰν ζάδηλον ἦδη \times s \times s \times . It is rarely combined with dd as in dactylo-epitrite; the iambelegus (156 D²) attributed to Sappho is as Lobel points out probably not aeolic at all, and we are left with the two encomiologi dd - s - Alc. 40, either κατὰ στίχον or paired in a stanza. Most characteristic is the combination with ds; so, for instance, in the first two lines of the best-known sapphic and alcaic stanzas:

ποικιλόθρον' ἀθανάτ' Ἀφροδίτα s \times ds \times
ἀσυννέτημι τῶν ἀνέμων στάσιν \times s \times ds

in Alc. 63

ἰόπλοκ' ἄγνα μελλιχόμευδε Σάπφοι \times s \times ds \times

and in Sappho 148 D². (if it is Sappho)

Μᾶλιν μὲν ἔννη λέπτον ἔχουσ' ἐπ' ἀτράκτω λίνον \times s \times ds \times s

Similar
times p
seven li

νεύ
Alcaeus
with as
initial a
Sap
chorian

The rel
Hephae
be incli
'series',
likely t
differen
Lon
with in

the wh
154 and

It is pos
little ha
repeats

This
formed
segment
whole i
rhythm
at the e
initial a
of the m
drama,
that the
can som
Thus θυ
μ' ὁ λυσ
πάλοι π
In Lesb
stanza;
is a rela
the sam

¹ Sapp
I hesitate
(by unp
ithyphall

Similarly *s* is found in combination with the complete glyconic, the whole being sometimes part of a larger compound: thus Alcaeus 54 has two glyconics linked to *s*, in seven lines repeating *κατὰ στίχον*

νεύουσιν, κεφάλαισιν ἄνδρων ἀγάλματα· χάλκισι δὲ πασσάλοισι - \cup ds | - \cup ds \cup s

Alcaeus 43 has stanzas of which the first and third lines give \cup s \cup \cup ds, alternating with asclepiads. The first line of Sappho's stanzas in 97 and 98 is similar, but drops the initial *anceps*.

Sappho 85 and 130 substitute *s* for initial *anceps* or aeolic base before juxtaposed choriamb:

ἀμφὶ δ' ἄβροις λαοῖσις εὐ ἐ πύκασσε s | d | d \cup

The relation of this to the regular ionic trimeters (cf. Sapph. 86, Alc. 68, 123) which Hephaestion says was the metre of whole songs of both poets is uncertain, but I should be inclined to regard the two as arrived at by different processes. The trimeters are a 'series', like the dactylic hexameters and iambic tetrameters, and it seems to me likely that such a modification as an opening metron - \cup - - (a phenomenon quite different from initial *anceps*) is a later, post-anacreontic refinement.

Longer segments of single-short¹ are much rarer, but Sapph. 114 gives - \cup - \cup - with initial *anceps*, juxtaposed with a prolonged unit:

γλῦκη μαῦτερ, οὐ τοι δύναμαι κρέκην τὸν ἴστον \cup ss | dss \cup

the whole being apparently repeated *κατὰ στίχον*. The same element *ss* is paired in 154 and given link and final *anceps*

δεῦρο δὴν τε Μοῖσαι χρύσιον λίποισαι ss \cup ss \cup

It is possible that such pairing is a characteristic form of Lesbian composition, though little has survived. Reference has already been made to Sapph. 126 d - d -, and 128 repeats *κατὰ στίχον* ds \cup ds \cup .

This brief account attempts to show how the separate lines of Lesbian poetry are formed and extended. I use the untechnical word 'lines' advisedly, since these segments, though sometimes used like cola and sometimes like periods, are not as a whole identifiable with either. When they repeat *κατὰ στίχον*, then like all other rhythms built 'line upon line' they have pause, and admit hiatus and *brevis in longo* at the end of each line, i.e. each line is a period. Such lines may of course have both initial and final *anceps*, since there is pause between the end of one and the beginning of the next. Where they are built up into stanzas they behave very like the cola of drama, but as we shall see with certain characteristic modifications. It may be noted that the separate lines themselves, even when they are multiple compounds of units, can sometimes be expressed in relation to each other like the simpler dramatic cola. Thus *θυρώρω πόδες ἐμπορόγυιοι* might be represented as a catalectic form of 'Ερος δὴν τέ μ' ὁ λυσιμέλης δόνει, οἱ ἦρος ἀγγελοῦς ἡμερόφανος ἀήδων οἱ ἡράμαν μὲν ἔγω σθένει Ἀτθὶ πάλαι ποτὰ, οἱ ὀφθαλμοῖς δὲ μέλαις νύκτος ἄωρος οἱ Φιττάκω δὲ διδοῖς κύδος ἐπήρατον, etc. In Lesbian poetry, however, the catalectic does not follow the full version within a stanza; the relation is merely traceable in the construction of the lines. Further, there is a relation of *ἐπιπλοκή* which appears to operate in these heterogeneous lines in just the same way as between iambic and trochaic series, or cretic and bacchiac series: a

¹ Sappho 152 D². is so full of uncertainties that I hesitate to formulate it. If it is to be tidied up (by unparalleled synizeses) into lekythion + ithyphallic I should be very doubtful of the

attribution to Sappho of such a dicolon; the full + catalectic, typical of Archilochus and Anacreon, is as indicated above un-Lesbian so far as our evidence reaches.

new set of lines is formed by transferring an initial syllable to final place. Thus, for instance, the alcaic to the sapphic hendecasyllable:

υ s υ ds

s υ ds υ

Sapph. 93 υ d ' ds υ to the asclepiad, and Sapph. 63 υ d ' d ' ds υ to the major asclepiad.

Stanzas always respond monostrophically and are of very simple construction. Here it is almost permissible to speak of cola, even where these are already composite. Thus, for instance, the most familiar alcaic stanza is usually given four lines, but while the first two admit hiatus and final *brevis in longo* the third and fourth (cf. 46B) are linked without pause, i.e. with the effect of cola. The scheme, in fact, is really *aab*; whereas in *a* the units are - - - and - - - - -, in *b* each of these lengthens, - - - being paired and - - - - - prolonged to - - - - - - - - -.

The same formula *aab* applies also to the Sapphic stanza, where - - - - υ is added as a short colon to the third hendecasyllable, starting sometimes in the middle of a word. Sapph. 96 (glyc. + glyc. + υ ∅ : - - - - - - - - -) has three separable lines, but 97 and 98 give three linked cola, cf.

ἀ δ' ἔρσα κάλα κέχυται, τεθά-	s ' υ ∅ ds
-λαισι δὲ βρόδα κάπαλ' ἄν-	υ ∅ ds
-θρυσκα καὶ μελίλωτος ἀνθεμίδης	υ ∅ dss υ

Alc. 118 is apparently three asclepiads + glyconic, but there is no evidence as to whether any of these are linked.

A notable point in all Lesbian stanzas is that even where there is hiatus or *brevis in longo* at the end of some or all of the lines, they keep a smooth carry-over by avoiding *anceps* at the end of one line followed by *anceps* at the beginning of the next. The new Alcaeus fragment 24 C in *Ox. Pap.* xviii. 2166 may, however, prove to be the first exception to this rule.

The anonymous skolia call for little metrical comment. The units of which they are composed are those familiar already from Pindaric verse; the simple stanza-structure recalls the Lesbian, though without any of the latter's special peculiarities. The major asclepiads of 14 and 19-22 D² are of normal alcaic type with aeolic base, and 9 has the familiar *aab* type of stanza:

ὁ κάρκινος ὦδ' ἔφα ¹	υ ds
χαλᾷ τὸν ὄφιν λαβίων	„
εὐθὺν χρῆ τὸν ἑταῖρον ἔμ-	glyc.
-μεν καὶ μὴ σκόλια φρονεῖν.	+ glyc.

The commonest form of Attic skolion (cf. 1-7 D².) appears to run *aabc*; there are no instances of linked *b* + *c*. The first two lines are probably both phalaeceans with aeolic base; the one exception in 7 which begins ὑγιαίνειν μὲν ἀριστον ἀνδρὶ θνατῷ is probably an *ad hoc* variant designed to accommodate the word ὑγιαίνειν, or indeed this may have been pronounced in three syllables - - -. Similarly the *anceps* in the middle of the second line appears only in order to accommodate the names Ἀρμόδιος καὶ Ἀριστογείτων in the series celebrating the tyrannicides: so in 10 D².

ἐν μύρτου κλαδί τὸ ξίφος φορήσω,	
ὥσπερ Ἀρμόδιος κἀριστογείτων,	- - - - - υ - - - -
ὅτε τὸν τύραννον κτανέτην	
ἰσονόμους τ' Ἀθήνας ἐποίησάτην.	

¹ This is more probable than the form in which it is quoted, ὁ δὲ κάρκινος ὦδ' ἔφα, on both metrical and stylistic grounds.

It is a
Ἀριστογ
probabl
twang c
The
free dac
I quote

It is a milder version of the *tour de force* by which Simonides achieves the name *Ἀριστογείτων* within an elegiac couplet (76 D²). The third line begins with what is probably a headless unit (λ ds ' d) of the Pindaric type, possibly with a wordless twang on the lyre; the fourth is a paired ds juxtaposed without link *anceps*.

The skolia attributed to the Seven Sages (31 ff.) are mostly composed in a kind of free dactylo-epitrite, all of individual pattern but built up from the ordinary units. I quote 35 D². *exempli gratia*:

ἀστοῖσιν ἄρεσκε πᾶσιν, ἐμ πόλει αἶ κε μένης·	- ds ∪ dd
πλείσταν γὰρ ἔχει χάριν. αὐθάδης δὲ τρόπος	- dd - d
πολλάκις βλαβερὰν ἐξέλαμψεν ἄταν.	sd ' ss -

A. M. DALE.

THE INTERPRETATION OF *RES GESTAE DIVI AUGUSTI*, 34. 1

In consulatu sexto et septimo postquam bella civilia exstinxeram | per consensum universorum [potitus rerum omnium] rem publicam | ex mea potestate in senat[us] populique Romani arbitrium transtuli.

Ἐν ὑπατείαι ἕκτῃ καὶ ἑβδόμῃ μετὰ τὸ τοὺς ἐμ[φυλίου]ς ζῆσαι με πολέμους [κ]ατὰ τὰς εὐχὰς τῶν ἐμῶν πολε[ι]τῶν ἐνκρατὴς γενόμενος πάντων τῶν | πραγμάτων ἐκ τῆς ἐμῆς ἐξουσίας εἰς τὴν τῆς συν[κλήτου] καὶ οὐ δήμου τῶν Ῥωμαίων μετήνεγκα | κυρίαν.

THERE is very little doubt about the reading of the Latin text, except that the Greek ἐνκρατὴς γενόμενος has suggested to Schönbauer that 'compos' should be read for 'potitus'.¹ He urges that 'compos' has a 'milder meaning' than 'potitus' and has no connotation of the use of force.² The change to 'compos' is worthy of consideration, but ἐνκρατὴς γενόμενος suggests that the Latin ran 'compos factus' if 'compos' was used, and the phrase 'compos factus', though good Augustan Latin, is perhaps too retarding in rhythm to fit this place, though to that stylistic feeling too much weight should not be assigned. And though 'potitus' may have a connotation of force, it has not always had that connotation and, in any event, the connotation seems to be removed by the phrase 'per consensum universorum', which will be considered later. Further, it is to be remembered that 'rerum potiri' is not only the climax of Roman ambition as observed by Lucretius in the lines:

certare ingenio, contendere nobilitate,
noctes atque dies niti praestante labore
ad summas emergere opes rerumque potiri. (2. 11-13)

It is a phrase that belongs to the vocabulary of Roman politics—for instance in Cicero, *ad Fam.* 1. 8. 4, 'qui potiuntur rerum' means the First Triumvirate, and in the *Aca- demica* (2. 41. 126) a political metaphor is used in the words 'Cleanseth Solem dominari et rerum potiri putat'. (Cf., on a more terrestrial plane, Cicero, *Cat.* 2. 9. 19 'dominationem tamen exspectant, rerum potiri volunt'.) So too Cornelius Nepos, *Atticus*, 9. 6, 'nemini enim in opinionem veniebat Antonium rerum potiturum'. On the other hand, I have not been able to trace the use of 'rerum compos' or 'rerum compos fieri' in any passage concerned with political power.

What follows in this note would not, however, be invalidated if some further discovery showed that the Latin text did in fact give 'compos' or 'compos factus' and not 'potitus', but, in default of any new evidence, I would not myself accept Schönbauer's suggestion.

The first question is this. Do the words 'per consensum universorum potitus rerum omnium' look forward or backward? Up to 1936 scholars, where their translations were not ambiguous, almost universally followed Mommsen in making these words look back to 'postquam bella civilia exstinxeram', 'after I had, being in virtue of the agreement of the whole community in complete control, put out the flames of the civil wars'. The one exception was Dessau,³ who, in discussing a paper by Wilcken in 1925,⁴ observes that the natural Latin order makes the words look forward to the rest of the sentence, viz. to 'rem publicam ex mea potestate in senatus populique Romani arbitrium transtuli'. In 1936 Berve⁵ pointed out that the Greek text by

¹ *S.B. Akad. Wiss. in Wien*, ccxxiv. 2 (1946), pp. 43 ff.

² *Ibid.*, p. 45.

³ *Phil. Woch.*, 1925, col. 1019.

⁴ *Berl. S.B.*, Phil.-hist. Kl., 1925, pp. 66-87.

⁵ *Hermes*, lxxi (1936), pp. 241-53.

using the *nominative* ἐγκρατὴς γενόμενος connects the words, not with μετὰ τὸ τοὺς ἐμφυλίους ἔβουαι με πολέμους but with μετήνεγκα, that is, with the second part of the sentence and not with the first. Barwick in the same year,¹ accepting Berve's point about the effect of the *nominative* ἐγκρατὴς γενόμενος, went further and made the words 'postquam bella civilia exstinxeram' a note of time dating 'potitus rerum omnium'. That is to say, Octavius' complete control 'per consensum universorum' does not refer to what *preceded* the last phase of the civil wars, but to what *followed* the last phase of the civil wars and *preceded* the transference of the State to the free decision of the Senate and People of Rome.

Now this is certainly so if the Greek text is a sure guide to the interpretation of the Latin text. But, it must be admitted, this is not beyond all doubt. Augustus wrote the Latin text, but it is not possible to believe he was also responsible for the Greek text, for various reasons including occasional omissions or misunderstandings of which the Greek text is guilty. Augustus was concerned only with the Latin text to be set up in Rome. Whoever was responsible for the Greek text (whether a provincial official, or, as Weber is inclined to think, a Greek secretary of Augustus) may not have had the knowledge, or may not have thought it his duty, to do more than reproduce what he supposed to be the meaning of the Latin text, a duty which he performed with imperfect success.² At whatever time Augustus wrote this part of the Latin text, it is practically certain that the Greek version was made after his death, and the translator may not have had any special knowledge of what happened more than forty years before the translation was made. None the less, while the Greek text is not decisive, it gives some support for the interpretation of Berve and Barwick. But there is, perhaps, a stronger argument against Mommsen's interpretation of the sentence. The words 'per consensum universorum potitus rerum omnium' cannot really echo what Augustus says in c. 25 about the situation at the outset of the war in 32 B.C.: 'iuravit in mea verba tota Italia sponte sua et me belli quo vici ad Actium ducem depoposcit. iuraverunt in eadem verba provinciae Galliae Hispaniae Africa Sardinia'. This is not a 'consensus universorum', nor does the phrase well describe this, even if supplemented by an oath of loyalty subsequently exacted in the eastern provinces after the defeat of Antonius. Thus the 'consensus universorum' does not appear to me to be the enabling factor which led to the triumphal ending of the civil wars. It is rather the enabling factor which had placed the State in Octavian's control at the time he took the step of transferring it to the free decision of the Senate and People of Rome.

I would punctuate the sentence with a comma after 'septimo' and a comma after 'exstinxeram' and without a comma after 'omnium'. And I would translate the sentence: 'In my sixth and seventh consulships, after I had put out the flames of the civil wars, I, having in virtue of the unanimous agreement of the community acquired complete control, transferred the State from my power to the free decision of the Senate and People of Rome.' I take the words 'in consulatu sexto et septimo' to be a note of time dating first 'potitus' and then 'transtuli', and I take the words 'postquam bella civilia exstinxeram' as in apposition, as it were, to 'in consulatu sexto et septimo'.

To return to the point that 'per consensum universorum' is the enabling factor that had placed the State (or everything) in Octavian's control when he took the step of transferring it to the free decision of the Senate and People of Rome.

¹ *Phil.*, xci (1936), pp. 350-2.

² For example, εἰς τὴν τῆς συνκλήτου καὶ τοῦ δήμου τῶν Ῥωμαίων μετήνεγκα κυρίαν does not precisely give the meaning of the carefully chosen phrase 'in senatus populiue Romani

arbitrium transtuli'; where 'arbitrium' is not just power or legal possession, which is what κυρίαν means, to judge from papyri and inscriptions.

What is the basis of this control? It cannot be derived from the fact that Octavian was or had been 'triumvir rei publicae constituendae' under the Lex Titia of 43 B.C. whereby the Second Triumvirate was set up, or in virtue of its subsequent renewal. Whether the triumviral powers of Octavian were renewed until the end of 33 B.C. or to the end of 32 B.C., their tenure secured by positive enactments had ended at least three years before Octavian's sixth consulship in 28 B.C. Further, even if Mommsen is right in supposing that Octavian could, as Antonius did, claim to be triumvir until either he renounced his powers or had them removed by the same authority that conferred them, there is no evidence that he did act in that way. His coins, for instance, do not now describe him as triumvir. And his own statement in *Res Gestae*, c. 7, that he was triumvir for ten years on end, is evidence that he did not act as triumvir beyond 32 B.C. at latest. Nor would it appear to be good politics to cling to an office once shared with Antonius and discredited by various *acta* which, as early as the beginning of 28 B.C., he declared to have been illegal. The view recently advanced by Staedler¹ that Octavian continued to be *triumvir sine collegis* seems to be refuted by the known political facts and not to be commended by being a constitutional oxymoron.

What other source of control could Octavian then possess, if the basis of his control was not the powers of a triumvir? Could it be a commission—an extraordinary command—to conduct the war against Egypt and, incidentally, Antonius? In the Praenestine Fasti under 11 January 29 we read, according to the accepted restoration,

... d[ebellavit] imp. Caesar Augustus tertium] ab Romulo et Ianum c[lausit] se V et Appuleio cos]

When on that day Octavian—for the first of three times in his career—caused the Temple of Ianus to be closed, it was, as may be gathered from chapter 13 of the *Res Gestae*, 'because victory had brought peace by land and sea wherever the imperium of the Roman people extended'. All wars had been extinguished, civil war and all: the *Pax Augusta* had begun. And if Octavian had received in 32 B.C. a special command to conduct the war against Cleopatra,² and if, as may be conjectured, this was to be the 'donec debellatum foret', the formal term of that command had been reached when the closing of the Temple of Ianus underlined the fact 'debellatum fuisse'. And when Octavian returned to Rome and celebrated his triumph in August of the year 29, he celebrated the fact that his commission had been executed to the full and so was at an end. During the time he held this special command and in 31, 30, and 29 cumulated it with the consulship, he might fairly be described as possessing more *potestas* than his several colleagues in the consulship. This is consistent with the famous statement in the last sentence of this chapter that 'Post id tempus auctoritate omnibus praestiti, potestatis autem nihilo amplius habui quam ceteri qui mihi quoque in magistratu conlegae fuerunt'. For the implication is that *before* that he *did* possess a larger share of *potestas* than his fellow consuls.

But the justification for this overplus of *potestas* had passed when on 1 January 28 B.C. he entered on his sixth consulship with Agrippa, the architect of victory at Actium, as his colleague. He marked the equal collegiality of Agrippa by passing to him his due share of the fasces and by conducting a census with him as his colleague. He became in fact consul with the same *potestas* as his colleague, that and nothing more. He abrogated illegal *acta* under the Second Triumvirate, and thus he cleared himself from the reproach of the misuse of a *triumvirale regnum*, as Cicero would have called it. At some time in the year 28—when precisely is not clear—he gave up the

¹ *Zeit. d. Sav. Stiftung, rom. Abt.* lxi (1941), pp. 77–122, esp. p. 91.

² F. de Visscher, 'Les Pouvoirs d'Octavien en

l'an 32 av. J.-C.', *Bull. de l'inst. hist. belge de Rome*, xix (1938), pp. 103–24.

control
further s
months,
wish to
position
Senate a
27 B.C. T
what she
decision
a single
mouth o
the Stat
was 'in
legal ma
well awa
would b
assume,
it is, in
between
was 'pot
Senate a
happene
not 'in c
of power
is dating
publican
the latte
sexto et
hard to
kind her

Next
potitus r
People f
purpose,
and he s
the wor
What is
Senate a
phrase
conclude
the wor
indicate
anything

It is
It could
of Roma
easy to
Euphrat
into Gre
of Asia,

¹ *Herm*
p. 43, n. 2

control of Asia, which will have come within the scope of his special command, a further sign that his commission was at an end. In the early days, and probably early months, of the year 28 he could not be described, and to all appearances he did not wish to be described, as 'potitus rerum omnium'. And yet he must have been in that position when he transferred the State from his *potestas* to the free decision of the Senate and People of Rome. When he did that is known; it was on 13 January 27 B.C. That was the day on which he invited the Senate and People of Rome to decide what should be done about the government of the State which he transferred to their decision. It could not be a series of piecemeal transferences, for 'arbitrium' implies a single decision. However fictitious the speech which Dio (53. 3-10) puts into his mouth on that occasion, two things are clear—that Octavian claimed to transfer the State 'ex sua potestate' and that, when he transferred it, he could claim that it was 'in sua potestate'. Octavian may not have been acquainted with the Roman legal maxim that no one can transfer more than he possesses, but he must have been well aware that if he was no more than the equal colleague of a brother consul he would be transferring more than was his to transfer. And he was, we may fairly assume, well enough versed in the game of politics to know that, if you are to discard, it is, in general, best to discard from strength. Something must have happened between the equal collegiality of the early part of the year 28 and the fact that he was 'potitus rerum omnium' when in January 27 he invited the 'arbitrium' of the Senate and People of Rome. And it is, it may be suggested, because something had happened in the latter part of the year 28 that the opening words of the sentence are not 'in consulatu septimo' (i.e. 27 B.C.) which would give the date of the transference of power, but 'in consulatu sexto et septimo' (i.e. 28 and 27 B.C.) because Augustus is dating 'per consensum universorum potitus rerum omnium' no less than 'rem publicam ex mea potestate . . . transtuli', the former falling, say, some time in 28 B.C. the latter falling on 13 January 27 B.C. To the significance of the dating 'in consulatu sexto et septimo' scholars do not appear to have directed their attention, but it is hard to think it is not significant and that its significance is not something of the kind here suggested.

Next, what meaning must be attached to the words 'per consensum universorum potitus rerum omnium'? What Augustus says he did is clear: he made the Senate and People free to decide how the State should be governed, releasing the State, for this purpose, from the grasp of his 'potestas'. But he did so when it was in his 'potestas', and he says so, because he was 'per consensum universorum potitus rerum omnium', the word 'potestas' here apparently summing up the effect of the preceding words. What is described, then, is the expressed readiness to submit to the 'arbitrium' of the Senate and People a control of the State obtained 'per consensum universorum'. The phrase 'consensus universorum' has been carefully examined by Instinsky.¹ He concludes that it reflects the general wish of the whole body politic. He observes that the words 'per consensum universorum' (instead of 'consensu universorum') may indicate a particular act conferring this *potestas*, though his own view is that it was not anything so positive.

It is natural to ask who were the 'universi' whose 'consensus' was thus operative. It could not mean the consensus of every one in sight or everyone within the bounds of Roman power. For provincials had no say who should govern Rome; and it is not easy to imagine that the views of Roman citizens resident from the Atlantic to the Euphrates were elicited. It must mean the Roman body politic, and the translator into Greek, perhaps, wrote *κατὰ τὰς εὐχὰς τῶν ἐμῶν πολιτῶν* to indicate to the Greeks of Asia, to whom Roman constitutional procedure was not a matter of common

¹ *Hermes*, lxxv (1940), pp. 265 ff. See also von Premerstein, *Vom Werden und Wesen des Prinzipats*, p. 43, n. 2 and p. 64.

knowledge, the gist of what occurred.¹ If the invitation to Octavian received formal sanction by a S.C. and a vote of the People, as is likely enough, 'universi' is a convenient synonym or *variatio* for 'Senatus Populique Romani', words which are to come in the last part of the sentence. If, as is at least possible, the words were written after the grant of the title *pater patriae* in 2 B.C.² by 'senatus et equester ordo populusque Romanus universus', the word 'universorum' might well have presented itself to Augustus' mind.

Let us then suppose that at some point in 28 B.C., by some manifestation of the general will,³ Octavian, though he had started the year by declaring himself the equal colleague of Agrippa, was granted or invited to exercise control of the State. What kind of political situation does this reflect?

The situation in 28 B.C. was not such as to make a community, anxious above all for peace, entirely content with the restoration of the traditional Republican practice. M. Licinius Crassus, perhaps as the price of siding with Octavian, had been enabled to win successes in the Balkans outside the sphere of the war against Egypt. He would return, and might he not be thinking, 'Sulla potuit: ego non potero?' Octavian's colleague Agrippa was loyalty itself and ready to be the second man in Rome if Octavian was the first. But might it not be well to put the State in the control of one man, to capitalize, for the greater security of peace, the triumph of Octavian in the form of a single control, the control of a man so ready to act *civiliter*?

If such a demonstration of confidence was made, as we may conjecture it was, what was to be Octavian's attitude? Again we may conjecture that it would seem to Octavian the path of wisdom to accept the control offered him and then 'potitus rerum omnium' to lay his power at the free decision of Senate and People as something which it was his to renounce. It would then be possible for him to rest his power on a considered Act of State, an 'arbitrium' more lasting than a 'consensus' might be. We would assume, even if Dio did not say so explicitly (53. 2. 7), that before the Act of State on 13 January 27 B.C. there were *pourparlers* with leaders in the Senate, of

¹ This suggestion I owe to Mr. G. T. Griffith, who kindly read this paper in MS. in its original form.

² 35. 1. See the admirable discussion of E. Hohl, 'Der Leistungsbericht des Augustus', *N. J. für antike und deutsche Bildung*, 1940, pp. 136-46.

³ Under what constitutional forms the general will manifested itself remains conjectural. Kornemann, *Röm. Gesch.* ii, pp. 120 f., suggests a 'Plebiscit . . . in Gestalt eines formlosen Konsensus aller Bürger, der noch vor Ablauf des Jahres 30 zustande gekommen sein muß und vielleicht zu einer gesetzlichen Regelung geführt hat'. Apart from the question of the date, on which this paper takes a different view, one would expect rather a S.C. perhaps confirmed by a vote of the Assembly, perhaps by some less formal expression of general approval. M. Grant, 'The Augustan Constitution', *Greece and Rome*, xviii (1949), pp. 100 f., would make the words 'per consensum universorum potitus rerum omnium' refer to a blending of *auctoritas* and *potestas* confirmed on 1 January 29 B.C. by some form of acclamation, but this seems difficult to combine with the assertion of Agrippa's equal collegiality a year later. J. Liegle, 'Die Münz-

prägung Octavians nach dem Siege von Aktium und die augusteische Kunst', *J.D.A.I.* lvi (1941), pp. 91 ff., esp. p. 116, would derive the *potitio rerum omnium* from the deputations that greeted Octavian at Brundisium in the winter of 31-30 B.C. as described by Dio, 51. 4. 4 ff. But apart from the apparent indication of date 'in sexto et septimo consulatu', it seems hard to believe that what Dio describes is more than the acknowledgement that Octavian had won a decisive victory. The coins to which Liegle refers appear to reflect this belief, especially in the Greek East, rather than any view of Octavian's constitutional position.

The main argument of the present paper would be stronger, it is true, if it was possible to say precisely how the *potitio rerum omnium* was brought about, but *Res Gestae* 34 is equally reticent about the constitutional grant of powers that followed the Act of State of January 27 B.C. It can quite fairly be urged that if there happened the manifestation of the general will that is here postulated, Dio should have mentioned it in his account of the year 28 B.C., but the silence of Dio cannot outweigh what appears to be the implication of what Augustus has said.

which after all Octavian was now *princeps*. And a solution was found in the settlement that followed which took account of the position. Without abandoning the principle asserted in January 28 B.C. of the equal *potestas* of the consuls, there was assigned to Octavian for a period a *provincia* so extensive and so militarily important that all danger of a challenge that might lead to civil war was removed. Crassus might return in peace to enjoy a triumph that did not endanger peace. The cumulation of the consulship at Rome with a great *provincia* abroad gave Octavian all he needed for the moment, though it was not, and perhaps Octavian knew it was not, the final solution. The principle enunciated at the beginning of 28 B.C., that as consul his *potestas* was not greater than that of his fellow-consul, was maintained. The challenge of autocracy was avoided. The name Augustus, the reward for a combination of primacy and strict constitutionalism, carried unimpaired the emotions of the *consensus universorum* which was crystallized in the *auctoritas* which Augustus, in the last sentence of this chapter, justly said he enjoyed thenceforward beyond any other Roman citizen.

If the above interpretation is correct, the first and last sentences of chapter 34 of the *Res Gestae* are a compendious illustration of Augustan statecraft.

F. E. ADCOCK.

KING'S COLLEGE,
CAMBRIDGE.

ON THE CRUCES OF HORACE, SATIRES 2. 2

THE 'four famous *crucis*' (Gow, ed. p. 4) of this satire are as interesting as notorious. I regard the first as solved, since I cannot imagine anybody (Horace included) improving upon Postgate's line 13 (see below). But I find instead a hitherto undetected but quite palpable flaw in the opening words.

quae uirtus et quanta, boni, sit uiuere paruo
(nec meus hic sermo est, sed quae praecepit Ofellus
rusticus, abnormis sapiens crassaque Minerua)
discite . . .

First of all, is there a parallel to this use of the plural vocative *boni*? *bone* or *o bone* occurs in Horace four times, *serm.* 2. 3. 31; 6. 51 and 95; *epist.* 2. 2. 37; also in Lucr. 3. 206, and (as Prof. G. B. A. Fletcher points out to me!) Persius 3. 94 and 6. 43; it does not seem to be cited from anywhere else. Its context in the following satire might well appear upon first inspection to present an analogy of situation so close as to confirm our vocative: *praecepit Ofellus, Stertinius . . . praecepta; nec meus, unde ego*. But this is an accident; for the circumstances are nevertheless dissimilar. The lemma for this usage in Doering's index is just right—'in blandis compellationibus'; but here the speaker addresses an audience, and his tone is austere—'*impransi mecum disquirite*', 7. An examination of those other four Horatian contexts establishes for the idiom a note of intimate personal appeal which seems absent from this. So also *ᾠγαθέ* in Plato, *Prot.* 311 a and 314 d; Ar. *Knights* 160. Lejay alone has produced a plural, *ᾠγαθοί*, Ar. *Knights* 843; but there Neil rightly observes that as addressed to the knights this is 'sarcastic', and of the singular he had said on 160 that it was 'not specially respectful'. If Heinze on our passage is right in describing the idiom as colloquial, it seems hardly appropriate to the style of this exordium. Peerlkamp also—of whom more anon—refused to accept *boni* as vocative; his reason was that it should refer to persons already indicated.

Wickham, who renders 'good sirs', describes that as 'Ofellus' address to some imagined audience of neighbours, rather than Horace's own, in which case it would be unlike his usual style'. This last remark he does not explain; but if he meant that the designation is too vague for one who is most precise in his vocatives, I incline to agree. Wickham's defence, on the other hand, seems to me untenable, since *discite* and *disquirite* lead straight to *cur hoc?* and so to all that follows, where Horace not only speaks in person (112) but ends by explicitly quoting Ofellus. Wickham would at least have to put line 1 by itself between inverted commas as a passing and partial quotation, and that would be pointless and unsatisfactory.²

These considerations are hardly decisive, but I suggest that a prior one is. What can be the force of *quae*? Not interrogative. Which virtue is frugality? The answer is frugality; nobody would ask. *quae* then can only be the indirect exclamatory, and that must make *quanta* an impossible tautology. (*quae et quanta* when neuter plural is of course quite different; cf. 70.) Besides, 'how great a virtue is frugality' is not the subject of this satire. Palmer explains *uirtus* as 'worth, value, advantage'; yet even that, although a much more adequate description, does not fully represent the subject

¹ I am again indebted to Prof. Fletcher for kindly reading and criticizing this article in manuscript; also for supplying me with additional illustrations as indicated.

² To assign to Ofellus directly lines 1 and 4-52

would not be a possible alternative; this is patently no 'rusticus' admonishing other rustics (with *boni* as 'my lads'); the terms of 16 (*promus*), 23-4, 31-3, 50-2, and other passages, indicate the townsman.

of this
thus to
two asp
and (b)
first sta
follows
70-136
I cannot
sit uiue
with it
stipulat
omnis c
this ma
far as i
until th
(infami
This
outlook
mained
For
boni (C
serm. 1
Caes. b
at 70 as
Peer
'si uirtu
et quan
and lin
boni as
indefen
Ibid. 23

In t
the wor
(pp. 5-
destruc
attemp
but lik
that O

of this satire; nor if it did, is it a legitimate rendering; for Horace is the last author thus to throw dust into his reader's eyes. The subject of this satire is one, but with two aspects, and those not altogether strictly separated: (a) what a *virtue* is frugality, and (b) what an *advantage*, what a *blessing*. And of these aspects although (a) is the first stated, (b) is throughout much the more prominent; roughly the distinction is as follows: (b), although formally and explicitly introduced at 70, not only occupies 70-136 but is the real topic of 9-38; (a) may be regarded as the main theme of 39-69. I cannot doubt that the first line as Horace wrote it was '*quae uirtus quantumque boni sit uiuere paruo*'. Unless we read thus, we entirely lose the point of the stipulation 4-6 with its reference to deceptive luxuries. Moreover, the connexion between that stipulation and *impransi* and *hoc* (= *impransi*) and so on to *male uerum examinat omnis corruptus iudex* is direct and unmistakable; no less so is the connexion between this maxim and all that follows from 9 to at least 38. The fact is, virtue as such, in so far as it is here to be distinguished from utility, does not even begin to show its head until the reproof of greed is suggested by line 40; thereafter it is to the fore at 48 (*infamis*), 52 (*prauis*), 54 (*uitium illud* is greed), 69 (*uitium hoc quoque*).

This twofold aspect of virtue, needless to say, is characteristic of the Horatian outlook; he had it first from his father, *serm.* 1. 4. 124 *inhonestum et inutile*; he remained faithful to it, *ibid.* 134-5 *rectius hoc est; hoc faciens uiuam melius*.

For the 'partitive' genitive with *quantum* compare *serm.* 2. 3. 87; 8. 55-6; *plus boni* (Cic. *off.* 1. 24. 83) and such expressions are frequent; Horace has *plus mali* at *serm.* 1. 2. 79; while *quantum boni* itself occurs, as Prof. Fletcher points out to me, in Caes. *bell. Gall.* 1. 40. 6 and Apul. *met.* 5. 14. I regard *quae quantaque secum adferat* at 70 as confirming my *quantumque*, not verbally, but essentially.

Peerlkamp conjectured *quae uirtus et quanta, boni quid uiuere paruo*, and added '*si uirtus complecteretur simul utilitatem, Horatius fortasse scripsisset quae uirtus et quanta homini sit uiuere paruo*', comparing Ovid *trist.* 5. 5. 27, Phaedrus 4. 12. 1, and line 72 of this satire. (Prof. Fletcher points out to me that the first to think of *boni* as gen. sing. was Woulard as referred to by Cruquius. But W.'s construction is indefensible.)

Ibid. 23-35

uix tamen eripiam, posito pauone, uelis quin
hoc potius quam gallina tergere palatum,
corruptus uanis rerum, quia ueneat auro
rara auis et picta pandat spectacula cauda;
tamquam ad rem attineat quicquam! num uesceris ista
quam laudas pluma? cocto num adest honor idem?

- 29 †carne tamen quamuis distat nihil hac magis illa†
30 †imparibus formis deceptum te patet esto†
unde datum sentis, lupus hic Tiberinus an alto
captus hiet? pontisne inter iactatus an amnis
ostia sub Tusci? laudas, insane, trilibrem
mullum, in singula quem minuas pulmenta necesse est.
ducit te species, uideo.

In the reintegration of the two corrupt lines, the heaviest (and prettiest) part of the work has already been done by Gow, whose 'special note' (pp. 59-61), critical note (pp. 5-6), and note (p. 52), best studied in that order, are wholly convincing on the destructive side and most salutary on the constructive. He exposes the folly of all attempts to accommodate *quamuis distat nihil*. 'Peacock does not taste like chicken, but like pheasant. This is a fact so patent to anybody who has ever eaten peacock that O.'s interlocutor was bound to raise it.' Gow accordingly reads within inverted

commas *carne tamen suaui distat nihil ut magis*, a truly illuminating transformation. (For *suaui* cf. 51.) After *magis* he places *esto*.

But of the residual line Gow has to admit that he can make nothing Horatian, so he adopts the favourite counsel of despair and ejects it as a versified note. He mentions, however, an amendment proposed to him by Postgate: the transposition, in all but the final word of each, of the two corrupted lines, thus:

- 30 *imparibus formis deceptum te patet.* 'ille
29 *carne tamen suaui distat nihil ut magis.* 'esto.

With Gow's objections both to the latinity and the sense of *imparibus formis* given under (a) on p. 60 I entirely agree. I cannot, however, agree with his complaint on p. 61 that line 30 is 'an abominable iteration'. This term should be restricted in textual criticism to the repetition of words. Line 30, apart from its defective expression, is no iteration at all but a variation, just such a variation as Horace (and other ancient poets) liked. Again, I can find no solid grounds whatever for Gow's notion that this satire has for some reason had the peculiar misfortune to be invaded four times over by metricized marginalia. On the contrary: (i) the notoriously awkward¹ passage 9-15 is completely and happily rehabilitated by Postgate's inspired supplement and repunctuation, *Hermathena*, xv (1908-9), pp. 416-18; (ii) for 89-93 see my note below; (iii) so also for 123.

As the next (but not the final) step consequential upon Gow's initial correction, Postgate's transposition appears to me to carry its credentials upon its face. It and it alone points, and at once, to the solution of the puzzle of *imparibus*; this was *inparibus*, that is to say *in paribus*. The rest is then inevitable. In what follows I italicize my new adjustments.

in paribus forma deceptum te patet. <'immo>
carne etiam suaui distat nihil ut magis. 'esto;
unde autem [Peerlkamp for datum] sentis etc.

"In the case of things that are otherwise on a par you are deceived by appearances, evidently." "On the contrary, it [peacock] also differs [from chicken] in the tastiness of its flesh; the flavours are as different as could be." "I bow to your opinion; but what about the case of the *lupus* (or² basse)?" For *immo . . . etiam* see Sen. *controu.* 2. 1. 7; Petronius 110. 2; Pliny, *N.H.*, *praef.* 13. (I owe all three references to Prof. Fletcher.) *illa* I assume to have been a stopgap. *forma deceptum te (esse) patet* is now perfect as a link between *corruptus uanis rerum* and *ducit te species, uideo*.

Ibid. 89-93

rancidum aprum antiqui laudabant, non quia nasus
illis nullus erat, sed, credo, hac mente, quod hospes
tardius adueniens uitiatum commodius quam
integrum edax dominus consumeret. hos utinam inter
heroas natum tellus me prima tulisset!

¹ The view of Lambinus—'seu pila te agit (lude pila), seu discus, pete aera disco'—defended by Housman in *C.R.* xv. 405 (and on Lucan 7. 323), is, in my judgement, a (prima facie) very obvious one, but rhetorically inexcusable, because the imperative *sperne* ('despise, if you can!') which is exactly right, has its force ruined by this preceding *pete* ('assail, if you care to'); for that and other reasons the whole sentence seems to me at this rate far too

maladroit for Horace.

² In *C.Q.* xxxix. 46-48 I took over the identification, more or less traditional with editors of H. and Juvenal (cf. L. & S.), of *lupus* with pike, but Sir D'Arcy Thompson in a letter tells me that the fish denoted 'is the basse, *Labrax lupus* (L.)'. I regret that in my footnote 3 I misunderstood his note in *C.R.* lii. 166-7. My argument on Juvenal 5. 103-6 depends almost entirely on the word *lupus* and is not actually affected.

I heartily agree with most of the objections raised against this passage by Palmer, ed. 1885, pp. 64-5; i.e. I agree with the words 'I do not believe . . . a guest arriving' and 'The whole passage . . . I deny they did'. Gow agreed with some of Palmer's objections, and added two others, with which I do not agree. Palmer suspected that these lines were spurious; Gow bracketed them, saying that even if they were genuine but out of place, it was difficult to see where else in the satire they could be inserted. My answer to that is that no passage itself in so unsatisfactory a condition could make a good fit anywhere in Horace.

To me it is inconceivable either that any generation of men 'praised rancid boar', i.e. as opposed to fresh, or that Horace or any responsible writer ever made such a statement. In particular, 'primitive people', as Palmer said, 'prefer their meat fresh'; and I would add that the Romans knew this, cf. Tac. *Germ.* 23 (*recens fera*), Pomp. Mela 3. 3 (*cruda carne aut recenti*). Again, *tardius adueniens* is the Latin for 'arriving too slowly' (it is utterly mistranslated by Lejay and others) and such an expression here is not only obscure (cf. Palmer again) but silly and ludicrous. Thirdly, two comparative adverbs thus closely related not merely by position but by syntax must in Horace have had some logical relation also; but to determine any such relation here between *tardius* and *commodius* can only make the situation more grotesque than ever.

On the other hand, I find clear evidence that we have here no arbitrary insertion (for what conceivable reason?) but the somewhat mangled remains of a genuine Horatian passage. '*Nasus*', says Gow, 'means "the nasal prominence" and not the organ of smell, which is *nares*'; strictly, this is true, but the greater includes the less; and that *nasus* and *nares* could be synonymous may be seen from Gow's own note on *serm.* 1. 6. 5. Positive indications of authenticity are: *integrum* 'fresh' opposed to *uitiatum* 'tainted', both terms appearing in the same senses at 4. 54 of this same book; *hac mente*, cf. *serm.* 1. 1. 30, *epod.* 1. 10 (also Cic. *fam.* 12. 14. 1); *commodius quam*, *serm.* 1. 6. 110; *edax*, four times elsewhere in H. The irony of 92-3 is, of course, inconceivable in an interpolator. Another and a stronger reason is that we have here what is obviously the companion picture to 4. 17-20 in this same book. In both passages Horace has in mind the Italian country life which he knew at first hand. There, an unexpected guest suddenly arrives at night; dinner is over (and the slaves have consumed the leavings); you have only a fowl, and that will be too fresh and therefore tough; your remedy is, etc. In the grim poverty of primitive days they could meet that situation only in the opposite way, with something that was already past its best; but that was better than nothing, and men did not then pamper their stomachs as we do. Such is the picture for which Latin, and Horatian Latin, is required. And finally I have one stronger reason still, but this must wait.

In a logical and competent writer, and still more in an elegant writer, a corrupted passage is almost invariably and almost inevitably quite different from its sound environment; and since this is a good example I beg leave in continuing my analysis to pursue it farther than space (or time) usually permits. At least two internal indications reveal that *laudabant* cannot have been the original verb. (i) *non quia . . . erat*; because those who prefer a certain meat 'high' can detect the difference only by (a) their sense of smell or (b) some other sense, taste—or even sight! If (a), which is the natural assumption, then this clause is obviously inapplicable; if (b), it is entirely irrelevant. (ii) *ea mente, quod . . . consumeret*; this does not explain *laudabant*; how H. really argued in such a matter will be evident from *serm.* 1. 1. 30-2 '*hac mente sese laborem ferre ut . . . recedent*'; the notion that 'praise' of rancid boar by 'the ancients' (in general—but as voiced by writers on gastronomy?) could prevail on guests to eat it in that condition but definitely not on hosts (even when 'greedy') is far too involved, as well as of course too imbecile, for Horace. For the rest, a sentence

beginning with *hospes* and ending with *consumeret* will refer to a guest who has already arrived; the first half of *adueniens* will therefore be corrupt, if (as is virtually evident) the inflexion itself is sound. I conjecture, for reasons which will presently become apparent, that the ancient (or medieval) editor had before him the Latin words *artius* (or *arctius*, perhaps in the form of *ardius*) *exiliens*, and that since these make no conceivable sense he had recourse to the margin, where he found (again, justification will duly follow) something like *hospes qui adesset uespertinus ex improviso*; from that he devised the emendation *tardius* and the substitution *adueniens*.

But do with them what you will, these five lines will obviously never fit here; Palmer and Gow have to that extent an overwhelming case. Mend the expression, however, as you would, and they will fit perfectly before 39; they obviously present the picture to which the contrast is given just below, 42-4. (And a third picture, a contrast to both, is given later, 118-25.) And yet again even then, they do not, it is surely evident, fit properly after 38. But when I take the one and only step which is necessary to make them do so, I find that without intending it I have also explained how the whole corruption arose. Below I print only 31-46; but I invite attention also from 23 (see note on that passage above) as far as 52. I italicize certain correspondences, the first of which (33, 36) concerns, while the others (89, 41-2; 89, 44-6; 92, 39-40) wholly result from, the proposed rearrangement.

- unde autem sentis, lupus hic Tiberinus an alto
captus hiet, pontisne inter iactatus an amnis
ostia sub Tusci? *laudas*, insane, *trilibrem*
mullum, in singula quem minuas pulmenta necesse est;
35 ducit te species, uideo. 'quo pertinet ergo
proceros odisse lupos?' quia scilicet illis
maiores natura modum dedit, his breue pondus.
38 ieunus raro stomachus uolgaria temnit.
38^a ieunus uere solita et fastidia ponit.
89 *rancidum* aprum *antiqui* seruabant; non quia nasus
illis nullus erat, sed, credo, hac mente, quod hospes
90^a ex improviso qui uespertinus adesset
acrius esuriens uitiatum (et) commodius quam
integrum *edax* dominus consumeret. hos utinam inter
93 heroas natum tellus me prima tulisset!
39 'porrectum magno *magnum* spectare catino
uellem' ait Harpyiis *gula* digna rapacibus. at uos,
praesentes Austri, *coquite* horum obsonia. quamquam
putet aper rhombusque *recens*, mala *copia* quando
aegrum sollicitat stomachum, cum rapula plenus
atque acidus mauolt inulas. '*necdum* omnis abacta
45 *pauperies* epulis regum; nam uilibus ouis
nigrisque est oleis *hodie* locus. *haud ita pridem*
Galloni' etc.

The earliest operative word for all this is *tamen* in 23. That adversative introduces the new subject, or new aspect of the same subject of luxury, and this lasts until 52. In these thirty lines the main theme is the *tyranny of fashion* in viands.

'Say what I may, I don't suppose I shall ever dissuade you from preferring peacock to chicken. External considerations govern you; ostentation, in that case. No? Not entirely? Well, anyway, in other cases the pursuit of rarity—a large mullet, a small basse; you have hardly ever been hungry, so you scorn the ordinary and esteem the fashionable dishes. What affectation! What a contrast to our

prim
to k
be s
and
and
"con
is ra

My
patently
transiti
ences fo
we are
odd—on
A New
to the P
sermone
(fundam

The
homoea
he reach
symbols
to say 'c
detected
some pa
on 38 (w
sion). T
thus bas
distincti

My t
to impro
I can b
curaban
from *lan*
by the i
ow, for
the open
dinner w
hac men
now wel
going wi
(lightly)
but a he
thesis b
supply
Juvenal
89-93 de
others) a
not argu
emphasi

¹ And
rancidula.

primitive and penurious (45) ancestors, who knew what real hunger is; they used to keep pork in their larders even after it had begun to smell; there must always be something in reserve for a visitor who might suddenly turn up, very hungry and late for dinner. Truly an "heroic" age! How different is ours, with its luxury and greed. These gourmets *deserve* that *their* meat should go bad before they can "consume it all still fresh". But no, that imprecation is not necessary; *their* pork is rancid to them, so queasy are their overloaded stomachs.'

My case for the transposition is not merely that it is possible, nor even that it is patently most apposite, but that it is indispensable. After 38, 39 is neither a sudden transition nor a good fit; it is a bad fit. From 31 to 38 we are concerned with preferences for *large* or *small* fish as (according to Ofellus) fashionable *affectations*. At 39 we are concerned with a preference for some *large* animal—not specified, which is odd—on a dish, for the quite different reason that it appeals to *greed*. In my *Horace*, *A New Interpretation*, a work more ignorant than stupid, I paid particular attention to the Horatian preference for 'abrupt transitions' as a characteristic of *carmina* and *sermones* alike. Abrupt in expression, these are nevertheless in logic sound and (fundamentally) clear. This one is entirely different.

The origin of (almost) all the trouble was the general similarity, and especially the homoearchon, of 38 and 38^a. This caused scribe (say) Q to omit it, but by the time he reached '93' he had observed his error, and he entered the line, with appropriate symbols, between 93 and 39; call it now 93^a. The result of this was—I am tempted to say 'of course'—that scribe R passed from 38 direct to '39'; but he, too, presently detected his blunder, and duly entered 89-93, either in the margin, or at the bottom of some page; 93^a he omitted on the very natural assumption that it was a bad variant on 38 (where the 'ieiunus rare' of some of our manuscripts would increase this impression). The damage at 90^a-91 was doubtless due to the fact that the passage had been thus bandied about, and therefore eventually cramped into the margin without due distinction of verses.

My two supplementary lines are *exempli gratia*, and every reader is most welcome to improve upon them. But to my alterations I can see no conceivable alternative. I can but wonder whether *antiqui seruabant* was read as *antiquis* (later *antiqui*) *curabant*, and whether this somewhat odd verb was then glossed (here only) *laudabant* from *laudas* just above (33). That mine was the sense, however, is indicated not only by the internal arguments given above, but by the proverb *λείπέ τι καὶ ξένους ἐπέλθοῦ*—*ow*, for which (with illustrations) see Plutarch, *quaest. conuiuii*. 7. 4. 6; and further by the opening of that discussion, where it is stated that to leave something over after dinner was a regular custom of the ancient Romans. *quod* I take to depend not on *hac mente* but (like *non quia*) on *seruabant*. For 90^a see 2. 4. 17. In 91 all words are now well placed in relation to one another; and *et commodius* prevents *acrius* from going with *esuriens*. *consumeret* 'eat up, eat all of it', *integrum* 'while still fresh'. The (lightly) ironic *heroas* in 93 makes it certain that 89 began with some sort of paradox; but a hero is one thing, a pervert another. There is, I reckon, some degree of antithesis between *heroas* and *Harpyiis*. With *magnum* in 39 we now can (and must) supply *aprum*; and now that we have this in association with *gula* we can see what Juvenal was echoing¹ in 1. 140-1 'quanta est gula quae sibi totos' (for *magnum* after 89-93 does mean *totum*) 'ponit apros'. The commentators (Schütz, Gow, Lejay, and others) assume, as indeed they must, that a small *mullet* has suddenly (in imagination, not argument) been placed before the epicure. This stultifies 42 by throwing the emphasis on *aper* and *rhombus* (as if these were notoriously better 'keepers' than

¹ And again, for *obsonia* thus in (logical) connexion with *rancidum* cf. Juvenal 11. 134-5 *obsonia rancidula*.

mullet); only my transposition will throw it on *recens*, where the internal logic of this sentence itself shows that it was meant to fall. Again, 44-6—whether or not with Gow's inverted commas (44-8) which I have adopted above—shows that some reference to the frugality of early times must have preceded. Finally, since my 38^a is so material, I will add that its presence thus in a context with *pauo* and *rhombus* (and *esuriens* proposed in 91) is consistent, at least, with 1. 2. 115-16 '*num esuriens fastidis omnia praeter pauonem rhombumque?*'

Ibid. 123

post hoc ludus erat culpa potare magistra.

Bentley's *nulla magistra* is no paradox; there never was such a lady; the paradox required is in effect *nullo magistro*, as (in effect) at 2. 6. 67-70; but this is patently not how the poet expressed it. The best (and only tolerable) existing proposal is Housman's *captu magistro*, which does give the required sense, and pointedly; but it is open to three objections. The corruption of *captu* into *culpa* is (despite Housman's learned and ingenious apology) transcriptionally most improbable. 'Capacity' is here too abstract a personification (and, I feel also, too elliptical a term) for the blunt and concrete Italian wit of Horace. And the hard core of the tradition, the *difficilis pars lectionis* which is the most unlikely to be an importation, is just that feminine which neither Bentley nor Housman nor any other critic has so far succeeded in justifying; the feminine which, it should surely seem more natural to presume, was in itself one-half of the paradox; with—no 'master', forsooth, but—something-or-other as mistress.

If a scribe found *erat*, ten to one he would 'correct' it into *erat*; and if he saw, or thought he saw, *culla*, what other noun would he make of this than *culpa*? Unfortunately, he had misread one letter; what he should have recognized was *erat trulla*.¹ Upon those happy occasions the only Master of Ceremonies was Mistress Ladle herself (Miss Measures, the Lady Gill). The main function of the *magister conuiuii* or (*carm.* 2. 7. 25) *arbiter bibendi* was to see that every guest drank an equal (*serm.* 2. 6. 67-70) or at least a proportionate (Plutarch, *quaest. conuiuii.* 1. 4. 2, §§ 7-8) amount of wine; and, once he had mixed the wine and water in the *crater*, the master could only perform that function through his control of the *trulla*, the vessel by which the drink was distributed from the *crater* to the individual cups. In his absence, therefore, the *trulla* is independent; she can do as she pleases—a playful way of saying that the drinkers can. And now for the diction of our passage—*luce profesta* 116, *trulla*, *potare*—compare the satire which follows, lines 143-4, *potare, trulla, diebus profestis*.

A. Y. CAMPBELL.

THE UNIVERSITY OF LIVERPOOL.

¹ Or did *erat culpa* come from what looked like *erat epulla*?

Of the
variet
There
W. C.
case w
of ide
emend
especi
would
is litt
lated e

The
order t
at it,
Cicero
is due
being r
Madvig
by L.
From
pectore
local a
iectum
comme
et litor
than el

We
dative

Th. 1.

Here S
place v
It is a l

Th. 2.

¹ I am
son and
tions in
² Lact
ptosis p
grammat
nor does
on Th.
posuit, q
³ A S
Flaccus
⁴ Stat

THE LOCAL ABLATIVE IN STATIUS¹

OF the unusual grammatical constructions which Statius employs for the sake of variety and novel effect, among the most remarkable is his use of the ablative case. There are striking instances at *Th.* 8. 157, *Th.* 10. 309,² *Ach.* 1. 219, *Ach.* 2. 129; and W. C. Summers³ was led to say: 'We see some traces in Valerius of the lax use of this case which became almost a disease with Statius, who employs it for almost any kind of idea.' There are three passages in Statius which have been misinterpreted or emended through the failure to recognize a use of the ablative to which he was especially prone—the local ablative where the poetic dative of 'motion towards' would seem more normal. I shall first list examples of this use in Statius where there is little or no doubt about interpretation or reading, and in the light of this accumulated evidence consider the three passages which are disputed.

The use of the local ablative (with or without *in*) after verbs of motion, often in order to stress the action or presence of a person or thing in a place after their arrival at it, occurs, of course, in authors before Statius. Madvig, in his detailed note on Cicero, *De fin.* 5. 30 *anulum . . . in mari abiecerat*, suggests that the construction there is due to the rapid transition of thought from motion to rest in a place, the point being not the throwing of the ring into the sea but the fact that it is beneath the waves. Madvig quotes other examples of this use of *in*, and instances from Livy are collected by L. Kühnast, *Die Hauptpunkte der Livianischen Syntax* (Berlin, 1872), pp. 190–1. From Statius we may compare *Th.* 2. 580–1 *nudo ne in pectore tela | inciderent (in pectore P, pectore ω)*, *Th.* 11. 542 *ensem germani in corpore pressit*. For the use of the local ablative without *in* where motion could be expected, compare Virg. *Aen.* 4. 373 *iectum litore*⁴ (see Forbiger and Pease ad loc., and Priscian iii. 309. 25 K where, commenting on this phrase, he says *pro ad litus*; cf. also iii. 315. 12 K *ecitur in litus et litore et litori*). In Statius, however, this construction both occurs more frequently than elsewhere, and is used more boldly.⁵

We may first consider Statius' use of *subeo*, commonly followed in poetry by the dative of 'motion towards'.

Th. 1. 406

(Tydeus) subit uno tegmine, cuius
fusus humo gelida partem prior hospes habebat.

Here Statius uses a local ablative in order to stress, not the arrival of Tydeus at the place where Polynices is, but his presence in it, and the fierce quarrel that results. It is a bold elliptical construction: Tydeus came, and was in the same shelter.

Th. 2. 624

dum clamat, subit ore cavo Teumesia cornus.

¹ I am indebted to Professor L. J. D. Richardson and Mr. O. A. W. Dilke for helpful suggestions in connexion with this article.

² Lactantius Placidus here comments 'antiposis pro cavae testudini', but this convenient grammatical label does not explain everything; nor does a comment such as that of Bernartius on *Th.* 1. 406: 'auferendi casum pro dandi posuit, quod est elegantiae priscae.'

³ *A Study of the Argonautica of Valerius Flaccus* (1894), p. 45.

⁴ Statius has the ablative with *iacio* in *Ach.*

2. 16 *hic spumante salo iaciens tumida exta profatur*. The *Thesaurus* (s.v. 37. 57) explains this ablative as absolute, but as compounds of *iacio* and *iacio* itself are not rarely followed by *in* with the ablative (e.g. Ovid, *Fast.* 4. 821 *fruges iaciuntur in ima—sc. fossa*), it is better to take *salo* as local.

⁵ See H. Frère in the *Budé Silvae*, Intro., p. 53: 'le poète, soucieux d'une expression originale—non vulgare loqui 5. 3. 214—ne renonce à aucune des ressources du lexique ni de la syntaxe'.

This¹ is exactly parallel: the spear is thrown, and even as Chromis shouts, is sticking in his open mouth.²

Secondly, Statius has the local ablative after *intro*:³

Th. 9. 872—3 . . . vulneris impatiens, umeri quod tegmine dextri
intrarat facilemque cutem.
tegmene *PBQCr Turon.*¹ tegmina *ω*

Here some of the inferior manuscripts have changed the ablative to the easier accusative.

Th. 11. 639—40 luctata est dextra, et prono vix pectore ferrum
intravit tandem.

In this passage it would be possible to regard *prono pectore* as absolute, but it is better taken as local.

Thirdly, there are several passages where Statius uses a local ablative after *cado*⁴ where motion is implied:⁵

Th. 5. 387—8 spiculaque et multa crinitum missile flamma
nunc pelago nunc puppe cadunt.

Here again the local ablative seems to be deliberate,⁶ as Statius wishes to stress, not the motion of the weapons towards the ship, but their effect when on it as described in the next phrases of the passage.

Th. 9. 535—6 illam nutantem nemus et mons ipse tremiscit,
qua tellure cadat.

Ach. 1. 43—5 non potui infelix, cum primum gurgite nostro
Rhoetæ cecidere trabes, attollere magnum
aequor . . . ?

Silv. 1. 2. 109—10 tellure cadentem
excepi. (Cf. *Silv.* 5. 5. 69, the same phrase.)

Tellure in this passage is wrongly⁷ explained by Vollmer (ad loc.) as dative. The *Thesaurus* is inconsistent, explaining it s.v. *cado*, p. 22. 70—1 as dative, but at p. 32. 20 f. including it in a list of ablatives.⁸

¹ See P. I. Österberg, *De structura verborum cum praepositionibus compositorum quae exstant apud C. Valerium Flaccum P. Papinium Statium M. Valerium Martialem* (Upsala, 1883), p. 69.

² The explanation of Barth's scholiast, *subit hominem ore*, where *ore* would be ablative of the route traversed, is not convincing. If the text of Prop. 4. 8. 10 *cum temere anguino creditur ore manus* is sound, there seems to be a somewhat similar construction there. See P. J. Enk in *Mnem.* (Tert. Ser.) viii (1940), pp. 314 f.

³ For the dative after *intro* see Langen on Val. Fl. 1. 590 *mediis intrarent montibus undae*, where, however, he wrongly explains *mediis montibus* as ablative absolute.

⁴ This very rare usage occurs also in Propertius 1. 17. 4 *omniaque ingrato litore vota cadunt*, and perhaps 1. 16. 34, where, however, see Enk.

⁵ Passages such as *Silv.* 1. 6. 13, 2. 5. 26, where *cado* is used with a local ablative where no motion is implied, are not unusual and do not concern us here.

⁶ See A. Nauke, *Observationes criticae et grammaticae in Publium Papinium Statium* (Vrat., 1863), p. 18, n. 7, where he maintains it is deliberate.

⁷ See Enk's note on Prop. 1. 14. 5, and his article in *Mnem.* (Tert. Ser.), viii (1940), pp. 314 f.: 'dativus in ε desinens nusquam apud poetas Latinos invenitur'. See also Kühner, *Lat. Gramm.* i, pp. 321—2, and Birt's edition of Claudian, *Intro.*, p. 222, where he comments on unusual ablatives in Claudian, and says 'quibus locis abuti possint qui dativos in ε cadentes aucupantur'. The passages already quoted, especially *Th.* 1. 406 and *Th.* 9. 536, make it plain that Statius is not using ε as a dative ending.

⁸ After *subeo*, *intro*, and *cado* there are instances (*Th.* 1. 255, 1. 427, 3. 385, 6. 341, 7. 238; *Silv.* 1. 5. 49, 2. 2. 105) where the case ending does not indicate whether we have the normal dative of 'motion towards' or the local ablative. Although there is no certain occurrence in Statius of the dative after any of these words, I do not

Lastly, I come to three passages where the unusual local ablative has led to doubt about the reading or interpretation.

Th. 1. 532

imperat acciri tacitaque immurmurat aure.

So the manuscripts: Klotz conjectures and prints *tacitaeque . . . auri*; Deipser conjectures *taciteque . . . auri*, Koestlin *tacitoque . . . ore*. Only in one other place does Statius use *immurmuro*, and there it has the customary dative (Th. 11. 63, quoted later). There is, however, no reason why we should deny the poet the variation between dative and ablative which, we have seen, pleased him, and it is wrong here to emend away the local ablative when the manuscripts without exception have kept the *lectio difficilior*. The *Thesaurus* defends the ablative, comparing Mart. Cap. 7. 725. 10 *aetheria Cylleni immurmurat aure*; and Heuvel in his edition of *Thebaid* I compares among other passages Ovid, *Met.* 3. 643 *pars quid velit aure susurrat*. This Ovidian ablative has not been left unassailed, and Roscher suggested *ore*, which Koestlin approved, but the manuscript tradition is rightly upheld by Ehwald ad loc.

Th. 11. 62—4

ergo procul vacua concedit valle,
ense fodit Stygio, terraeque immurmurat absens
nomen . . .

concedit PBLMfr Turon.: consedit alii

Here we have an instance where the difficulty of the ablative has led to the substitution of an easier verb in some manuscripts. The passage, describing how Tisiphone withdraws in order to summon Megaera to her, has reminiscences of Ovid, *Met.* 11. 183 ff. 'qui cum nec prodere visum | dedecus auderet, cupiens efferre sub auras, | nec posset reticere tamen, *secedit humumque* | effodit et domini quales aspexerit aures | voce refert parva, *terraeque immurmurat* haustae'. The Ovidian use of *secedit*, together with the testimony of the best MS. *P*, indicates that we should certainly read *concedit*. The ablative *vacua valle* is explained by Klotz as instrumental, while Mozley compares *ibam via sacra*. Neither explanation is satisfactory, because Tisiphone does not withdraw by means of or by way of an empty valley, but into an empty valley, where she pursues her nefarious purpose. We have here in fact another instance of the local ablative used after a verb of motion: Statius wishes to stress what Tisiphone did in the valley, not her journey thither or arrival there. There is here again a bold ellipse: 'And so she withdrew, and was in an empty valley far away, and there she dug up the ground', etc.

Ach. 1. 329

ac sua dilecta cervice monilia transfert.

So the manuscripts: Damsté conjectured *dilecta sua*,¹ which much weakens the sense. Schrader's suggestion, *detecta* for *dilecta*, is not convincing. Nauke (op. cit., pp. 24 f.) will not allow a local ablative here—though he admits that the sense would be much improved if it were local—and lamely explains *dilecta cervice* as if it meant 'from the beloved neck of Thetis', adding that it is only because Achilles loves Thetis so much that he will accept the necklace. This is indeed a *vox desperationis*. The meaning must be that Thetis takes off her necklace and puts it on the neck of her beloved

think we can assume the substitution of a rare construction for a common one unless it is indicated grammatically. Statius frequently uses the normal dative of 'motion towards' with other verbs, and *cado* is often followed by *in* with the accusative, and it seems that his audience could not in ambiguous cases do otherwise than interpret him in the normal way. This principle would apply to ambiguous cases after other

verbs, e.g. *Ach.* 2. 61 *solo procumbere*, Th. 7. 427 (*Asopus*) *descendebat agris*, both quoted by Brinkgreve as ablatives parallel to *Ach.* 1. 43. Any suggestion that Statius habitually avoided the normal construction would be false: he varied it occasionally for effect.

¹ So does S. Jannaccone in her edition of the *Achilleid* (Florence, 1950) ad loc.

Achilles. There is an exceptionally bold ellipse here: she hands over her necklace, and it is there on his beloved neck. This is indeed a straining of the language, but a quite possible extension of the usages already quoted; and we see from *Silv.* 2. 1. 101 f. 'vidi ego transsertos alieno in robore ramos | altius ire suis' that Statius was prepared to use a local construction after a compound of *trans*. The reason for which the poet has chosen so condensed an expression as *cervice transferre* becomes clearer when we think of his very vivid pictorial imagination—which is admitted by those who deny him much else—and bear in mind that this line occurs in a passage of great pictorial power about the transformation of the youthful Achilles into a girl, and is shortly afterwards followed by a simile of an artist moulding a waxen image. All the emphasis is on the picture of Achilles in his new guise, with his female attire, his softened neck and shoulders, his combed tresses, and the necklace about his neck.

UNIVERSITY OF READING.

R. D. WILLIAMS.

IN a
de Fa
occu
τριγων
δμογε
γραμμ
279-8
τὸ με
δνάδα
ἡ δνά
σῶμα
of the
τὸν λό
the n
exten
and 4
A
Theor
σχημα
γῆν,
ἴδωρ,
Pyth
such
the fi
spuri
Stob.
(καί)
in a
fifth
ἀπλῶ
ἴδατο
F
οὐδὲ
τῶν μ
ῶσπε
ταῖς
ἄνθρω
this s
know
φρονο
ὡς ὁδ
cours
Pyth
this n
ὅν ἀρ
πρασι
εἶτα
τάσδε

necklace,
age, but a
i. 101 f.
prepared
the poet
when we
who deny
pictorial
s shortly
emphasis
ned neck

LIAMS.

POLYCLITUS AND PYTHAGOREANISM

IN a well-known quotation from Speusippus in the *Theologumena Arithmeticae* (82. 10 de Falco), said to have been derived from Pythagorean sources, especially Philolaus, occur the following sentences: τὸ μὲν γὰρ ἐν σιγμῇ, τὰ δὲ δύο γραμμῇ, τὰ δὲ τρία τρίγωνον, τὰ δὲ τέσσαρα πυραμῖς. ταῦτα δὲ πάντα ἐστὶ πρῶτα καὶ ἀρχαὶ τῶν καθ' ἕκαστον ὁμογενῶν. And again a little later: πρώτη μὲν γὰρ ἀρχὴ εἰς μέγεθος σιγμῇ, δευτέρα γραμμῇ, τρίτῃ ἐπιφάνεια, τέταρτον στερεόν. Similarly Sextus Empiricus (*Math.* 10. 279-80), drawing evidently on a relatively early Pythagorean source, writes as follows: τὸ μεταξύ διεῖν σημείων νοούμενον ἀπλᾶτὲς μήκος ἐστὶ γραμμῇ. τοῖνυν ἔσται κατὰ τὴν δυάδα ἡ γραμμῇ, τὸ δὲ ἐπίπεδον κατὰ τὴν τριάδα, ὃ μὴ μόνον μήκος αὐτὸ θεωρεῖται καθὼς ἦν ἡ δυάς, ἀλλὰ καὶ τρίτην προσεληφε διάστασιν τὸ πλάτος . . . τὸ δὲ στερεὸν σχῆμα καὶ τὸ σῶμα, καθάπερ τὸ πυραμοειδές, κατὰ τὴν τετράδα τάπτεται. And Aristotle himself writes of the Pythagoreans (*Met.* 1036^b12): καὶ ἀνάγουσι πάντα εἰς τοὺς ἀριθμούς, καὶ γραμμῆς τὸν λόγον τὸν τῶν δύο εἶναι φασιν. There were, in fact, certain Pythagoreans who equated the number 2 with the line because they regarded the line as 'length without breadth extended between two points'; and likewise the number 3 was equated with the plane and 4 with the solid.

Aëtius, in a passage (2. 6. 5) the reliability of which, despite its derivation from Theophrastus, has been repeatedly contested, writes of Pythagoras that πέντε σχημάτων ὄντων στερεῶν, ἅπερ καλεῖται καὶ μαθηματικά, ἐκ μὲν τοῦ κύβου φησὶ γεγονέναι τὴν γῆν, ἐκ δὲ τῆς πυραμίδος τὸ πῦρ, ἐκ δὲ τοῦ ὀκταέδρου τὸν αἶρα, ἐκ δὲ τοῦ εἰκοσαέδρου τὸ ὕδωρ, ἐκ δὲ τοῦ δωδεκαέδρου τὴν τοῦ παντός σφαῖραν. The ascription of this doctrine to Pythagoras himself is, of course, demonstrably false; but there is no reason at all why such a doctrine should not have been held by the Pythagoreans of the latter half of the fifth century B.C. A fragment attributed to Philolaus, which, though probably spurious, is at any rate the work of a competent forger, runs as follows (Fr. 12 ap. Stob. *Ecl.* 1. 1. 3 *ad fin.*): καὶ τὰ μὲν τὰς σφαίρας σώματα πέντε ἐντί, τὰ ἐν τῇ σφαίρᾳ πῦρ <καὶ> ὕδωρ καὶ γᾶ καὶ ἀήρ, καὶ ὁ τὰς σφαίρας ὀκτὰς (?) πέμπτον. And Theo Smyrnaeus, in a list of ten Tetractyes that are undoubtedly Pythagorean in origin, says of the fifth such Tetractys (97. 13 Hiller): πέμπτη δ' ἐστὶ τετρακτὺς ἡ τῶν σχημάτων τῶν ἀπλῶν σωμάτων. ἡ μὲν γὰρ πυραμῖς σχῆμα πυρὸς, τὸ δὲ ὀκταέδρον αἶρος, τὸ δὲ εἰκοσαέδρον ὕδατος, κύβος δὲ γῆς.

Finally, Aristotle writes of the Pythagoreans (*Met.* 1092^b8): οὐθὲν δὲ διώρισται οὐδὲ ὁποτέρως οἱ ἀριθμοὶ αἴτιοι τῶν οὐσιῶν καὶ τοῦ εἶναι, πότερον ὡς ὅροι (οἷον αἱ σιγμαι τῶν μεγεθῶν, καὶ ὡς Εὐρυτος ἔταττε τίς ἀριθμὸς τίνος, οἷον ὁδὶ μὲν ἀνθρώπου ὁδὶ δὲ ἵππου, ὥσπερ οἱ τοὺς ἀριθμοὺς ἄγοντες εἰς τὰ σχήματα τρίγωνον καὶ τετράγωνον, οὕτως ἀφομοιών ταῖς ψήφοις τὰς μορφὰς τῶν φυτῶν), ἢ ὅτι λόγος ἡ συμφωνία ἀριθμῶν, ὁμοίως δὲ καὶ ἀνθρώπος καὶ τῶν ἄλλων ἕκαστον; Theophrastus also (*Met.* 2, p. vi¹⁹ Usener) mentions this same peculiar method of Eurytus, and incidentally names the source whence his knowledge of it came: τοῦτο γὰρ (sc. μὴ μέχρι του προελθόντα παύεσθαι) τελέου καὶ φρονούντος, ὅπερ Ἀρχύτας ποτ' ἔφη ποιεῖν Εὐρυτον διατιθέντα τινὰς ψήφους· λέγειν γὰρ ὡς ὁδε μὲν ἀνθρώπου ὁ ἀριθμὸς, ὁδε δὲ ἵππου, ὁδε δ' ἄλλου τινὸς τυγχάνει. There could, of course, be no more reliable witness than Archytas on Eurytus and contemporary Pythagoreans. And, to complete the picture, Alexander gives a few more details of this remarkable procedure (*In Met.* 827. 9): κείσθω λόγος χάριν ὅρος τοῦ ἀνθρώπου ὁ πρὸς ἀριθμὸς, ὁ δὲ τῇ φυτοῦ. τοῦτο θείς ἐλάμβανε ψηφίδας διακοσίας πεντήκοντα τὰς μὲν πρασίνας τὰς δὲ μελαίνας, ἄλλας δὲ ἐρυθρὰς καὶ ὅλως παντοδαποῖς χρώμασι κεχρωσμένες. εἶτα περιχρίων τὸν τοῖχον ἀσβέστω καὶ σκιαγραφῶν ἀνθρώπων καὶ φυτῶν οὕτως ἐπήγγυ τάσδε μὲν τὰς ψηφίδας ἐν τῇ τοῦ προσώπου σκιαγραφίᾳ, τὰς δὲ ἐν τῇ τῶν χειρῶν, ἄλλας δὲ

ἐν ἄλλοις, καὶ ἀπετέλει τὴν τοῦ μνημονεύοντος ἀνθρώπου διὰ ψηφίδων ἰσαρίθμων ταῖς μονάσιν ὡς ὀρίζειν ἔφασκε τὸν ἄνθρωπον.

I have argued elsewhere¹ that the three doctrines described in the passages quoted above are parts of a single and consistent cosmology. In compliance with the demands of Zeno, the post-Zenonian generation of Pythagoreans, admitting that the geometrical point had no magnitude, and that therefore two points *in contact* could not (as their predecessors had believed) constitute a line, had yet contrived to retain the equation of the number 2 with the line on the ground recorded by Sextus. Two points without magnitude imposed upon the continuum of infinitely divisible space generate a line, three a triangle, and four a tetrahedron. And having got so far, these Pythagoreans evidently proceeded, as always, to extend their mathematical conclusions to the physical universe. Accepting Empedocles' four elements as the simplest of bodies, they next equated the particles of each of the four with one of the regular solids of geometry. Fire derives its essential quality from the fact that it is made up of pyramidal particles; or, in other words, it is its bounding surfaces, and the points that bound those surfaces, that make it what it is. And so, finally, by an even more remarkable extension of the same underlying doctrine, we find Eurytus, apparently in all seriousness, equating such natural species as man or horse with the number of points necessary to bound the surfaces that are peculiarly their own. Each of the three doctrines, in fact, represents one aspect of the fundamental Pythagorean doctrine of the imposition of Limit upon the Unlimited; and the whole remarkable theory is thus briefly summed up in one of a number of parallel passages in Aristotle's *Metaphysics* (1090^b5): εἰσὶ δέ τινες, οἱ ἐκ τοῦ πέρατα εἶναι καὶ ἔσχατα τὴν σιγγμὴν μὲν γραμμῆς, ταύτην δ' ἐπιπέδου, τοῦτο δὲ τοῦ στερεοῦ, οἷονταί εἶναι ἀνάγκη τοιαύτας φύσεις εἶναι—φύσεις, of course, here bearing the sense of 'separate entities'.

In this tentative reconstruction of the Pythagoreanism of the end of the fifth century there is one feature that seems, at first sight at least, particularly difficult to accept. Can any philosopher of so relatively advanced a date, and of such considerable eminence as Eurytus apparently achieved, have really adopted so singularly crude a method of equating concrete things with numbers? That is the particular question to which, in this article, I shall attempt an answer.

In the longest of the four parallel accounts of Pythagoreanism which Sextus Empiricus, drawing on some unknown source, has preserved for us, there is an interesting and allegedly Pythagorean analysis of existing things into the three classes, τὰ κατὰ διαφοράν, τὰ κατ' ἐναντίωσιν, and τὰ πρὸς τι. Unfortunately, quite apart from numerous linguistic considerations, the passage is pretty conclusively proved to be contaminated with Platonism by the fact that Simplicius (*Phys.* 247–8), quoting so reliable an authority as Hermodorus, attributes an almost identical analysis to its obvious inventor, Plato himself. But in spite of that, there are also certain indications that some at least of the doctrines here expounded may go back to an earlier date; and one such indication is the short passage that immediately concerns us. Sextus writes of the class τὰ κατὰ διαφοράν as follows (*Math.* 10. 263): κατὰ διαφοράν μὲν οὖν εἶναι τὰ καθ' ἑαυτὰ καὶ κατ' ἰδίαν περιγραφὴν ὑποκείμενα, ὅσον ἄνθρωπος ἵππος φυτόν γῆ ὕδωρ ἄῤῥ πῦρ. Now in this one short sentence there are two very significant suggestions. In the first place it is, to say the least, a remarkable coincidence that the examples here cited to illustrate the doctrine are identically the same as those which all our evidence shows to have been treated by Eurytus and his Pythagorean contemporaries. 'Man' and 'horse' are perhaps such obvious illustrations that the parallelism so far could be easily discounted. But φυτόν,² whatever precisely that is intended

¹ *Pythagoreans and Eleatics*, pp. 101–11, 150–8. Since I have there described what I take to be the details of Eurytus' procedure, I refrain from

repetition here.

² For the use of φυτόν in Pythagorean literature cf. also 'Philolaus', fr. 13.

to mean in this and the parallel contexts, seems a rather less automatic choice; and the addition of the four elements, wholly uncalled for in this sentence of Sextus, is surely most plausibly explained by the conclusion that he is drawing either on certain of the passages already quoted, or, much more probably, on some common source—possibly even Archytas himself. So far, in fact, there seems good reason to conclude that this passage from Sextus is not unconnected with others already discussed.

And that first impression is, on closer inspection, greatly strengthened. For this sentence from Sextus obviously implies also a close connexion between outline on the one hand and essence or definition on the other. There could, indeed, hardly be a clearer indication of this connexion than that the words *τὰ κατ' ἰδίαν περιγραφὴν ὑποκείμενα* are used to define the whole class of sensible objects. I strongly suspect that Sextus is here using the word *περιγραφὴ* in exactly the sense in which it would have been used by Eurytus. It would most probably have been originally applied, in Pythagorean circles, to the boundary of geometrical figures such as the triangle or square. But the essence or definition of a triangle is precisely its *περιγραφὴ*, its three sides: this it is that distinguishes a triangle from any other plane figure. And so, when the application of the word became wider and less technical, it would be only natural that the distinction which it originally expressed between the essential and the non-essential should still for a time cling to it.

Whoever he was, then, whom Sextus was using as his source, seems to support the view that it was the outline of objects that these Pythagoreans regarded as the essential factor. But even so, the *σκιαγραφία* of Eurytus appears still an astonishingly crude procedure. Must there not have been more in it than we have yet recognized? May there not, in particular, have been also involved in it some theory of proportion such as the Pythagoreans were always seeking? I believe that there may.

It is worth noting, in the first place, that in the passage already quoted from Alexander the pebbles, which Eurytus employed to represent the points by which the *περιγραφὴ* was bounded, are said to be variously coloured; and probably those of one colour were used to delineate the face, those of another the hands, and so on. If that is indeed so, then, it seems to me it is hard to resist the conclusion that some consideration would inevitably have been paid to the precise number of pebbles of each colour employed in each sketch; and that conclusion in turn leads inevitably, of course, to some theory of proportions. But against such an argument must be set the facts that both Aristotle and Theophrastus, neither of whom gives any indication that the pebbles were variously coloured, describe the procedure as if Eurytus was concerned only with the total number of pebbles used; while even Alexander, although he tacitly conveys the suggestion that the proportions of the parts of the body may also have been studied, yet expressly agrees with the two more reliable authorities that Eurytus' primary concern was with the total number, irrespective of colour.

There are, however, two other passages which admittedly differ radically from this last in that they are not nominally concerned with the Pythagoreans at all, but which may yet throw some light on the same question. Indeed the first of them is concerned with a philosopher both of a different period and of a different school, namely Chrysippus. This is a passage from the work of Galen entitled *Περὶ τῶν καθ' Ἱπποκράτην καὶ Πλάτωνα* (4. 3; vol. v, p. 448 Kühn). Galen writes of Chrysippus thus:

ἐπὶ μὲν γὰρ τοῦ σώματος ἀκριβῶς αὐτὰ διωρίσαστο, τὴν μὲν ὑγιάν τῶν στοιχείων ἐν συμμετρίᾳ θέμενος, τὸ δὲ κάλλος ἐν τῇ τῶν μορίων. ἐδήλωσε γὰρ σαφῶς τοῦτο διὰ τῆς προγεγραμμένης ὀλίγον ἔμπροσθεν ῥήσεως, ἐν ἣ τὴν μὲν ὑγιάν τοῦ σώματος ἐν θερμοῖς καὶ ψυχροῖς καὶ ξηροῖς καὶ ὑγροῖς συμμετρίαν εἶναι φησιν, ἅπερ δὴ στοιχεῖα δηλονότι τῶν σωμάτων ἐστίν, τὸ δὲ κάλλος οὐκ ἐν τῇ τῶν στοιχείων, ἀλλ' ἐν τῇ τῶν μορίων συμμετρίᾳ συνίστασθαι νομίζει, δακτύλου πρὸς δάκτυλον δηλονότι, καὶ

συμπάντων αὐτῶν πρὸς τε μετακάρπιον καὶ καρπὸν, καὶ τούτων πρὸς πῆχυν, καὶ πῆχεως πρὸς βραχίονα, καὶ πάντων πρὸς πάντα, καθάπερ ἐν τῷ Πολυκλείτου Κανόνι γέγραπται. πάσας γὰρ ἐκδιδάξας ἡμᾶς ἐν ἐκείνῳ τῷ συγγράμματι τὰς συμμετρίας τοῦ σώματος ὁ Πολύκλειτος ἔργῳ τὸν λόγον ἐβεβαίωσε, δημιουργήσας ἀνδριάντα κατὰ τοῦ λόγου προστάγματα, καὶ καλέσας δὴ καὶ αὐτὸν τὸν ἀνδριάντα, καθάπερ καὶ τὸ σῆγγραμμα, Κανόνα. τὸ μὲν δὴ κάλλος τοῦ σώματος ἐν τῇ τῶν μορίων συμμετρίᾳ κατὰ πάντας ἱατροὺς καὶ φιλοσόφους ἐστίν, ἡ δὲ ὑγεία τῶν στοιχείων αὐτῶν πάλιν, ἅττα ποτ' ἂν ἦ, πρὸς ἁλληλά ἐστι συμμετρία.

This whole passage is of very great interest, and especially, perhaps, the clauses that I have indicated in heavy type. Those clauses tell us, first, that Chrysippus linked the belief that beauty lies in the proportions of the parts of the body with the other doctrine that health lies in the proportions of the bodily elements, and later that 'all doctors and philosophers' accepted at any rate the former view. It is not, unfortunately, clear from Galen's words whether he refers only to doctors and philosophers of his own day or to all doctors and philosophers up to that time; but the latter interpretation, even though it turns his remark into a dangerously sweeping generalization, yet seems hardly less plausible than the former. In any case it is surely significant that this view of health, that it consists in the right proportions of the elements in the body, is precisely the *ισονομία* view originally introduced by Alcmaeon. Aëtius (5. 30. 1) tells us that Ἀλκμαίων τῆς μὲν ὑγείας εἶναι συνεκτικὴν τὴν ἰσονομίαν τῶν δυνάμεων, ὑγροῦ, ξηροῦ, ψυχροῦ, θερμοῦ, πικροῦ, γλυκέος, καὶ τῶν λοιπῶν, τὴν δ' ἐν αὐτοῖς μοναρχίαν νοσοῦ ποιητικὴν. The view described by Galen, if not identical, is obviously very similar to this doctrine of Alcmaeon; and Alcmaeon, even if not among the most orthodox of Pythagoreans, was at least very closely connected with the school. Moreover, we learn from the *Iatrica* of Meno (ap. *Anon. Londin.* 18. 8, p. 31) that Philolaus also, with whose name that of Eurytus is almost invariably coupled, held what is really only a variant of the *ισονομία* view. It is true that according to his doctrine the human body is composed only of the hot, without share in the cold. But for that very reason it proceeds, immediately after birth, to inhale the cold in order that it may be cooled thereby: διὰ τοῦτο δὴ καὶ ὄρεξις τοῦ ἐκτὸς πνεύματος, ἵνα τῇ ἐπεισάκτῃ τοῦ πνεύματος ὀλκῇ θερμότερα ὑπάρχοντα τὰ ἡμέτερα σώματα πρὸς αὐτοὺ καταψύχῃται. The beginning of life, in other words, is marked by the harmonizing of the hot in the body with the surrounding cold, and death is clearly marked by the cessation of that process; and to that considerable extent at least the medical theory of Philolaus coincides with that described by Galen. We find, in fact, in this passage from Galen the view that beauty lies in the proportions of the parts of the body coupled with another view that was held not only by Alcmaeon but also, in a variant form, by a distinguished Pythagorean contemporary and associate of Eurytus himself, namely Philolaus. It is, of course, only the 'beauty' and not the 'essence' of man that was said by Chrysippus and 'all doctors and philosophers' to lie in these proportions. But in answer to this objection it may be held that the ground was prepared by the one theory for the other, and that the step from 'beauty' to 'essence' was but a short one. And finally in this connexion, it is interesting to learn that Polyclitus not only practised his Canon in his art but also expounded it in writing. It is at least very probable that the Pythagoreans would have been acquainted, if only indirectly, with his theory; and if that be granted, it is surely beyond dispute that, with their passion for number and proportion, they would have been very greatly interested in it.

Even this argument derived from Galen could, I admit, be easily dismissed as an insignificant coincidence. But coincidences do not often repeat themselves, whereas this particular coincidence does. There is a long passage from Vitruvius (3. 1. 2-7) the central theme of which is something so very like the Canon of Polyclitus that it

pretty clearly derives therefrom. The most relevant sentences of this passage run thus:

Corpus enim hominis ita natura composuit uti os capitis a mento ad frontem summam et radices imas capilli esset decimae partis, item manus palma ab articulo ad extremum medium digitum tantundem, caput a mento ad summum verticem octavae, cum cervicibus imis ab summo pectore ad imas radices capillorum sextae, (a medio pectore) ad summum verticem quartae, etc. etc. . . . Item corporis centrum medium naturaliter est umbilicus. Namque si homo conlocatus fuerit supinus manibus et pedibus pansis circinique conlocatum centrum in umbilico eius, circumagendo rotundationem utrarumque manuum et pedum digiti linea tangentur. Non minus quemadmodum schema rotundationis in corpore efficitur, item quadrata¹ designatio in eo invenietur. Nam si a pedibus imis ad summum caput mensum erit eaque mensura relata fuerit ad manus pansas, invenietur eadem latitudo ut altitudo, quemadmodum areae quae ad normam sunt quadratae. Ergo si ita natura composuit corpus hominis, uti proportionibus membra ad summam figurationem eius respondeant, cum causa constituisse videntur antiqui ut etiam in operum perfectionibus singulorum membrorum ad universae figurae speciem habeant commensus exactionem. Igitur cum in omnibus operibus ordines traderent, (tum) maxime in aedibus deorum, (quorum) operum et laudes et culpa aeternae solent permanere. *Nec minus mensurarum rationes, quae in omnibus operibus videntur necessariae esse, ex corporis membris collegerunt, uti digitum, palmum, pedem, cubitum, et eas distribuerunt in perfectum numerum, quem Graeci τελειον dicunt, perfectum autem antiqui instituerunt numerum qui decem dicitur.*

In this passage from Vitruvius we find, in an even more obvious form, precisely the same phenomenon as we found in that other passage from Galen. The theory of the ideal proportions of the parts of the human body, as expounded in the Canon of Polyclitus, is here in Vitruvius, as it is in Galen, closely linked with another belief which we know, from numerous other sources, to have been held not only by the Pythagoreans in general but also in particular by the author of the fragments attributed to Philolaus. Aristotle himself, in a criticism of Pythagoreanism (*Met.* 986^a8), tells us that *τελειον ἡ δεκάς εἶναι δοκεῖ καὶ πᾶσαν περιελγῆναι τὴν τῶν ἀριθμῶν φύσιν*. The same fragment of Speusippus from which I quoted earlier, which is said to have been compiled *ἐκ τῶν ἐξαιρέτως σπουδασθεῖσων ἀπὸ Πυθαγορικῶν ἀκροάσεων, μάλιστα δὲ τῶν Φιλολάου συγγραμμάτων*, opens with the words *ἔστι δὲ τὰ δέκα τέλειος (ἀριθμός)*, and is thereafter exclusively concerned with the peculiar properties of the Decad. And again, a fragment attributed to Philolaus (*Fr.* 11, ap. Stob. *Ecl.* 1. 1. 3) not only starts with a similar assertion—*θεωρεῖν δεῖ τὰ ἔργα καὶ τὴν οὐσίαν τῷ ἀριθμῷ κατὰ δυνάμιν ἅπας ἐστὶν ἐν τῇ δεκάδι*—but also contains a sentence remarkably reminiscent of that clause in Vitruvius, 'quae in omnibus operibus videntur necessariae esse', namely: *ἴδοις δέκα οὐ μόνον ἐν τοῖς δαιμονίοις καὶ θείοις πράγμασι τὰν τῷ ἀριθμῷ φύσιν καὶ τὰν δυνάμιν ἰσχύουσαν, ἀλλὰ καὶ ἐν τοῖς ἀνθρωπικοῖς ἔργοις καὶ λόγοις πᾶσι παντᾶ καὶ κατὰ τὰς δημιουργίας τὰς τεχνικὰς πάσας καὶ κατὰ τὰν μουσικὰν*. Moreover, in this instance, unlike the other from Galen, the further doctrine with which the Canon is coupled, the belief in the perfect nature of the Decad, is one that was, for a long time at least, peculiar to the Pythagoreans.

All this, of course, is very far from being conclusive; but it is perhaps enough to establish two interdependent probabilities. It would seem likely, in the first place, that the Canon of Polyclitus was mentioned, and probably summarized, in some Pythagorean source known both to Vitruvius and to Galen; and if that be granted,

¹ Cf. Pliny, *Nat. Hist.* 34. 55-6.

then it would again seem probable that this source, if not actually the work ascribed to Philolaus, was at any rate influenced by that work. That, unfortunately, does not get us very far; because if, as seems most probable, the work of 'Philolaus' is indeed spurious, then there is no obvious means of assessing the date of its composition. And thereafter the rest can only remain the merest conjecture. But, for the reasons that I have attempted to explain, it would seem to me the most plausible explanation of the otherwise fantastic procedure of Eurytus that he was concerned not only with the outline of the bodies that he delineated with his pebbles, but also with the doctrine, accepted with gratitude from Polyclitus, that '*ita natura composuit corpus hominis uti proportionibus membra ad summam figurationem eius respondeant*'.

J. E. RAVEN.

KING'S COLLEGE,
CAMBRIDGE.

ELE

ui
asCORN
Minim
cutem
hiatus
coque

ba

throu
aureis
percit
comm
stimu
Plin.

An

engra
1693,
Tucf. 16
radia
polita
19. 1.
bus co
25. 1.
specti
tudine

Fu

muric
10. 6
habitu
disting
27. 6.
tis'; 2
30. 3.
fulgen

An

1. 24.
auro p
note f
B.I. 1
chron
86. 1
the ar
ἐλέφας
flumin

ELEPHANT TACTICS: AMM. MARC. 25. 1. 14; SIL. 9. 581-3;
LUCR. 2. 537-9

post hos elefantorum fulgentium formidandam speciem et truculentos hiatus uix mentes pauidae perferebant; ad quorum stridorem odoremque et insuetum aspectum magis equi terrebantur. (Amm. Marc. 25. 1. 14.)

CORNELISSEN, *Mnemosyne*, xiv (1886), 280, comments: 'Non intellego *fulgentium*. Minime audiendus est Wagnerus, qui fulgentes elephantes dictos esse contendit ob cutem glabram. Corrigendum puto *ingentium*. Porro non satis intellego quomodo hiatus elefantorum militibus pauorem incutere potuerit. Wagnerus, qui omnia conquire solet, interpretatur *proboscidas*. Nescio an scripserit A. *barritus*.'

barritus for *hiatus* seems not too likely a scribe's error. Is not the point that through the *hiatus* the fearsome *barritus* proceeds? Cf. 16. 10. 7 'dracones, hastarum aureis gemmatisque summitatibus inligati, hiatu uasto perflabiles, et ideo uelut ira perciti sibilantes'; Luc. 1. 205 ff. 'sicut squalentibus aruis | aestiferae Libyes uiso leo comminus hoste | subsedit dubius, totam dum colligit iram; | mox, ubi se saeuae stimulauit uerbere caudae | erexitque iubam et uasto graue murmur hiatu | infremuit'; Plin. *N.H.* 8. 21. 56 'conspecto leone hiatu minaci'.

An elephant with *truculentus hiatus* confronts the reader on the left of the spirited engraving *Explanatio Expugnatae Amidae*, adorning Gronouius' Ammianus (Leyden, 1693, facing p. 235).

Turning to *fulgentium*, Ammianus likes to remark the sheen of arms and arrays; cf. 16. 10. 8 'ordo geminus armatorum, clipeatus atque cristatus, corusco lumine radians, nitidis loricis indutus, sparsique catafracti equites . . . ut Praxitelis manu polita crederes simulacra, non uiros'; 18. 8. 4 'radiantium armorum splendore'; 19. 1. 2 'cumque primum aurora fulgeret, uniuersa quae uideri poterant armis stellantibus coruscabant'; 19. 2. 2 'corusci globi turmarum'; 24. 7. 8 'coruscus nitor armorum'; 25. 1. 1 'radiantes loricae limbis circumdatae ferreis, et corusci thoraces, longe prospecti'; 31. 10. 14 'arma imperatorii comitatus auro colorumque micantia claritudine'.

Further, *fulgeo* and *fulgor* are words congenial to him; cf. 15. 8. 15 'imperatorii muricis fulgore flagrantem'; 16. 5. 5 'stragulis sericis ambiguo fulgore nitentibus'; 16. 10. 6 'fulgenti claritudine lapidum uariorum'; 20. 4. 22 'fulgentem eum augusto habitu'; 20. 7. 2 'cum agmine catafractorum fulgentium'; 21. 1. 4 'lapidum fulgore distincto'; 23. 6. 84 'lumine colorum fulgentibus uario'; 25. 1. 1 'siderum fulgore'; 27. 6. 11 'iamque fulgore conspicuum'; 28. 4. 8 'non nullos fulgentes sericis indumentis'; 28. 5. 3 'signorum aqualarumque fulgore praestrici'; 29. 5. 15 'fulgore signorum'; 30. 3. 5 'signorum fulgentium nitore'; 31. 10. 9 'splendore conspicui, proculque nitore fulgentes armorum'.

Ammianus knows and adapts Florus; for *fulgentium* with *elefantorum* cf. Flor. 1. 24. 16 (of Antiochus at Mount Sipylus) 'elephantis ad hoc immensae magnitudinis, auro purpura argento et suo ebore fulgentibus, aciem utrimque uallauerat'; we may note further the gilded battlements on the gigantic howdah of the elephant at Ioseph. *B.I.* 1. 42, or the breastplates on the same beast at *A.I.* 12. 373; the anonymous chronicler of the *de Bello Africo*, 72. 4 'ornatusque ac loricatus cum esset elephas'; 86. 1 'elephantosque LXIII ornatos armatosque cum turribus ornamentisque capit'; the armour of mail on the elephants in Heliodorus (9. 18. 8); Polyæn. 8. 23. 5 μέγιστος ἐλέφας . . . τοῦτον σιδηραῖς φορέαν ὀχυρώσας, Pliny, *N.H.* 8. 5. 12 'Antiocho uadum fluminis experienti renuit Ajax alioqui dux agminis semper; tum pronuntiatum eius

fore principatum qui transisset, ausumque Patroclum ob id phaleris argenteis, quo maxime gaudent, et reliquo omni primatu donauit'; Sil. 9. 581-3 'fulget . . . '.

Perhaps the elephants were adorned to improve their fighting will; cf. Pliny the Elder's *quo maxime gaudent* cited. Another aim probably was to strike fear into the enemy, on the principle of Tac. *Germ.* 43. 6 'nam primi in omnibus proeliis oculi uincuntur'. Appian (8. 7. 43, of Zama) writes οἱ μὲν ἐλέφαντες κατήρχον τῆς μάχης, ἐς τὸ φοβερώτατον ἐσκενασμένοι. Cf. *praeefulgentem* in Gell. 5. 5. 3 (Antiochus strives to impress Hannibal) 'conuertebatque exercitum insignibus argenteis et aureis florentem; inducebat etiam currus cum falcibus et elephantos cum turribus equitatumque frenis, ephippiis, monilibus, phaleris praeefulgentem'. Josephus (*A.I.* 12. 372) writes κελεύσας δὲ ἀλαλάζει τὴν στρατιὰν προσβάλλει τοῖς πολεμοῖς, γυμνῶσας τὰς τε χροσὰς καὶ χαλκὰς ἀσπίδας, ὥστε αὐγὴν ἀπ' αὐτῶν ἀφίεσθαι λαμπράν. R. Marcus notes: 'The shields of gold (also mentioned in 1 Macc.) are a fictitious detail. Polybius tells us, xi. 9. 1, that Philopoemen had his soldiers keep their arms bright in order to inspire the enemy with fear.'

Regarding Sil. 9. 581-3

stat niueis longum stipata per agmina uallum
dentibus, atque ebori praefixa cominus hasta
fulget ab incuruo directa cacumine cuspis,

Walter C. Summers, *Classical Review*, 14, 1900, p. 305, writes:

'Thilo has shown the absurdity of the old explanation, that the *hasta* referred to in 582 was fastened to the howdah, which involves taking "incuruo cacumine" as the elephant's curved back (so Cellarius, cited by Ruperti without comment, and Lewis and Short s.v. *cacumen*). Thilo, however, believes that both the men who are killed by the elephant were killed by its *tusks*, and reading "utque" renders "the point of its tusk shines as though a spear were fixed in front of the ivory."

'Surely there is no need to alter the MSS., no objection to taking the passage to mean that to each tusk a spear was fastened—so that what the tusks failed to pierce, the spear might reach. Ufens is clearly killed by the "sceleratum dentem", but Tadius is pierced by the "spicula dentis", which I take to mean the spears attached to the tusks. The singular "dentis" will not cause any difficulty, as the word is simply added to define "spicula". This rendering alone gives *directa* its true force: at the end of the curving tusk is the straight spear. "Cominus" must, I suppose, draw attention to the fact that the spear is for thrusting. "Incuruus" really applies to the "dens", of which the "cacumen" is part.'

Summers's view seems sound; regarding the spears fastened to the tusks, recently reading *Portuguese Voyages 1498-1663*, ed. Charles David Ley (Everyman's Library), I noted in Mendes Pinto (Henry Cogan's translation):

Chapter 42 (op. cit., p. 214) 'Thirty paces after this guard marched fourscore elephants exceeding well furnished, with chairs and castles adorned with silver [cf. Amm.'s *fulgentium*] which they carried on their backs, and on their teeth [*Tusks*, notes Ley] their *panoures*, or warlike defences, together with many little bells of the same metal hanging about their necks.'

Chapter 42 (op. cit., p. 218) '... two hundred elephants armed with castles, and warlike *panoures*, which are certain swords that are fastened to their teeth when they fight, . . . '

Silius' 'stat niueis longum stipata per agmina uallum | dentibus' suggests a word on Lucr. 2. 537-9 'anguimanus elephantos, India quorum | milibus e multis uallo munitur eburno, | ut penitus nequeat penetrari': see Bailey. Ernout and Robin,

record
proper
Gi
defen
hyper
at Pl
VIII
9. 581
in bat
Pyrrh
but is

Wi

NOV

MAAS
says:
13.'

Th
Navig
reason
the su
in the

If
Di
sailing
that I
(cf. es
ments
case fo
on our

Th
(siege
Xenop
Sir
phon's
here w

THE

1 I
Gery fo
2 If
cal wi
δεκανα
II. 4 se
depend

recording Merrill's citation of Plin. *N.H.* 8. 10. 31, seemingly envisage a palisade proper. Perhaps Lucretius refers to some legend now lost.

Giussani, reported by Bailey, takes the passage as poetic exaggeration of the defence of India by elephants against Alexander. *milibus e multis* may be a poet's hyperbole; but it may be merely repetition of some source, if we can trust the figures at Plin. *N.H.* 6. 20. 67 'elephantorum IIII in armis habet'; 6. 20. 68 'elephantorum VIII per omnes dies stipendiantur'. As to *uallo . . . eburno, uallum* recurring in Sil. 9. 581 suggests that the Ivory Vallum (cf. 'the thin red line') for the elephants ranged in battle-line may have been proverbial in Roman military lore since the wars against Pyrrhus and Carthage. Lucretius, it may be, has in mind no palisade of lost legend; but is merely saying poetically that elephants are the backbone of India's defence.

E. L. B. MEURIG DAVIES.

WINCHCOMBE,
CHELTENHAM.

NOTE ON THE NOVA HELLENICORUM OXYRHYNCHIORUM FRAGMENTA¹

MAAS'S annotation on Fr. C, col. I in his edition of the new fragments (*C.Q.* xliv. 8-11) says: 'fortasse conferendi Diod. 13. 66. 6; Xen. *Hell.* 1. 3. 16-22; Dionys. Byz. *Anap.* 13.'

The comparison of Fr. C, col. I with the passage in Dionys. Byz. *De Bosphori Navigatione* 13 (μικρὸν δὲ ὑπὲρ αὐτοῦ Δήμητρος καὶ Κόρης κτλ.) seems to prove beyond reasonable doubt that the city referred to in the fragment is Byzantion. Consequently the supposition that the papyrus tells the story of the siege of Byzantion—dealt with in the other two passages quoted by Maas—becomes almost a certainty.

If that is correct we have, I suggest, to place Fr. C before Fr. B.

Diodoros narrates the story of the siege of Byzantion before relating Alkibiades' sailing to Klazomenai and the battle of Notion. Since it seems to be demonstrable that Diodoros was dependent, through Ephoros, on the author of the new fragments (cf. esp. Fr. B, col. II with Diod. 13. 71. 2-4) we have to restore the order of the fragments in accordance with the chronological sequence of Diodoros' story.² But the case for rearrangement does not hang on the supposition that Diodoros is dependent on our P.

The battle of Notion is placed after the siege of Byzantion not only by Diodoros (siege and capture of Byzantion, 13. 66. 4-6; battle of Notion, 13. 71. 2-4) but also by Xenophon (Byzantion, *Hell.* 1. 3. 16-22; Notion, 1. 5. 12-14).³

Since there is no ground whatsoever either for doubting the correctness of Xenophon's and Diodoros' chronology in this case, or for supposing that P would be wrong here while they are right, the priority of Fr. C to Fr. B seems to be certain.

ALEXANDER FUKS.

THE HEBREW UNIVERSITY,
JERUSALEM.

¹ I am indebted to Professor H. T. Wade-Gery for his help.

² If the author of the new fragments is identical with the Historian of Oxyrh. (and the δεκαταίαν Fr. B, col. II. 21—δεκταταίαν *Hell. Oxy.* II. 4 seems to point in this direction), Diodoros' dependence would seem even more certain.

³ Xenophon does not happen to mention the sailing of Alkibiades to Klazomenai (Diod. 13. 71. 1—Fr. B, col. I). This event is slightly earlier than the battle and closely connected with it. The siege and capture of Byzantion took place before, Klazomenai and Notion after, Alkibiades' return from exile and his stay at Athens.

PERIPLUS MARIS ERYTHRAEI

ἐμπόριον νόμιμον and other expressions.

THE expression *ἐμπόριον νόμιμον* used in the *Periplus M.E.* has attracted a certain amount of attention. It is generally held to mean 'a legal mart where foreign trade was officially allowed and taxed' (E. H. Warmington, *Commerce between the Roman Empire and India*, pp. 53, 57): and this translation has sometimes been made the ground of comparison with the treaty ports of China or the *échelles* of the Levant. On closer examination of the usage of the *Periplus M.E.* it seems difficult to accept this meaning, and possible to suggest another.

The word *ἐμπόριον* is used in *Periplus M.E.*, according to my count, just fifty times, that is to say very frequently. It is a descriptive term for places: instead of being called cities, towns, or villages (they are occasionally so described), the majority of places named in the text are called *ἐμπόριον*. Occasionally a contrast is expressed or implied between places which were *ἐμπόρια* and those which were not: thus *Okēlis* is *οὐχ οὕτως ἐμπόριον ὡς ὁρμος καὶ ὕδρευμα* (cap. 25), and *Leukē Kōmē* *ἔχει δὲ ἐμπορίου τινά* (cap. 19). The oft-recurring phrase *προχωρεῖ εἰς τὸ ἐμπόριον* which I discussed in another connexion in *C.Q.* 1949, 61 ff. gives us a sense which is suitably rendered 'market'. However, the more frequent occurrences as a term descriptive of a certain kind of place are best rendered 'trading-place' or 'mart'. We may take the word as meaning a place where the traders 'undid their corded bales'.

In this descriptive sense the term is applied to thirty-seven named places in the text. Of these, twelve are on the west coast of the Red Sea or the east coast of Africa, and six are on the east coast of the Red Sea-Hadramaut-Persian Gulf-Sind: the remaining nineteen are in India proper.

Out of these thirty-seven *ἐμπόρια* only three are described as *ἐμπόριον νόμιμον*. They are Adouli on the west coast of the Red Sea, Mouza on the east coast of the Red Sea, and Apologou (later Obollah) in the territory of Charax Spasinou (this last not being actually visited but only mentioned). It is surely difficult to believe that out of all these thirty-seven places named as 'trading-places' it was only at these three that trade was 'legal' or 'officially allowed', while in visiting the other thirty-four the Greek traders were committing some kind of an irregular act. There is not the slightest hint of this in the text. There is no caution as to possible interference by authorities, no hesitation in giving details of topography and market requirements. To all appearances a visit to any *ἐμπόριον* is normal, safe, and lawful. As for the payment of dues, the only reference to this matter is their collection by a Roman official at *Leukē Kōmē* which had only 'something of a market'. There are references to wares 'for the king' here or there, but these do not refer to dues and probably not even to presents, but merely to wares for which there was a demand at the court of the local ruler.

One must, I think, come to the conclusion that the phrase *ἐμπόριον νόμιμον* has some different meaning from that above proposed. The meaning which I venture to suggest is 'law-abiding mart', i.e. 'a trading-place where law applies', 'a trading-place where traders are protected by law'. This is an admitted alternative meaning of *νόμιμος*. It is illustrated in Liddell and Scott by a quotation from Isocrates (Blass 2. 22: *πρὸς Νικοκλέα*) peculiarly apt to our case—*ἅπασιν μὲν τοῖς ξένοις ἀσφαλὴ τὴν πόλιν παρέχε καὶ πρὸς τὰ συμβόλαια νόμιμον* 'make the city safe for all strangers and law-abiding as to contracts', that is to say 'a place where foreigners' contracts are protected by the laws'.

One can see that this meaning applies very well to Adouli, Mouza, and Apologou. These were all places which thrived on a considerable transit trade, places where traders would have made contracts to bring goods on the next voyage or to have return cargoes ready or to buy a future cargo at a set price—forward contracts of all kinds. Clearly operations of that kind would quickly have necessitated a set of rules and a tribunal to settle disputes which would have been provided by the local ruler (certainly at Apologou) or by the merchants themselves.

It will be observed that there is no place in India which is called *ἐμπόριον νόμιμον* in *Periplus M.E.*

Obviously, on the generally barbarous coasts of Africa and Arabia or at the far-away head of the Persian Gulf, it was requisite to distinguish the three great 'law-abiding marts' from the lesser places where trade was not indeed unlawful but was not protected by law. In more civilized conditions in India it may be that foreign traders could appeal for legal protection everywhere and it was unnecessary to distinguish the places where they could from those where they could not: or, on the other hand, perhaps they had no protection of this kind and had not felt the need of it, for the Indian ports flourished on the trade of their rich hinterlands and were not dependent on an import-export transit trade in the same way as Adouli or Mouza and so there would not be the same need to arrange the affairs of foreign traders.

In India there are two groups of places on the coasts of the northern Konkan and the southern Konkan respectively which are described as *ἐμπόρια τοπικά*. The explanation of this, I think, as follows. The termini at which the monsoon voyages aimed were, as *Periplus M.E.* tells us, Barygaza and Mouziris (also the Indus mouths). These ports on the west coast between those two termini would be visited only if, after reaching their goal at Barygaza or Mouziris, the Greek traders found time and opportunity to coast down or up to these intervening ports. Hence they are named as 'local ports', places which might be visited in some seasons but not in others. The Coromandel ports were the object of a deliberate further voyage beyond Mouziris and are not, therefore, *ἐμπόρια τοπικά* in the same sense as the Konkan ports.

One of these Konkan ports, Kalliena, is stated to have been *ἐμπόριον ἔνθεσμον* 'in the time of the elder Saraganos', but since Sandanes came ships visiting those parts are hindered and are diverted to Barygaza (cap. 52). I have discussed the historical background of this statement in *C.Q.* 1947, 136 ff. The meaning of *ἔνθεσμος* is not, in any case, the same as that of *νόμιμος*. It means 'what is recognized by public law', in German *öffentlich-rechtlich*. This agrees with the only other occurrence in *Periplus M.E.*, viz. cap. 23 *Χαριβαήλ, ἔνθεσμος βασιλεὺς ἐθνῶν δύο*, where it clearly means something like 'publicly acknowledged', 'lawfully constituted'. In relation to Kalliena, it means no more than 'lawfully accessible', 'accessible without let or hindrance from any authority': the real point is that a new authority (that of Sandanes) now interferes with access, so the place has become *ἀνένθεσμος*, if the word may be coined.

The impression has been given also that Ptolemy uses the name *ἐμπόριον* alone for places which *Periplus M.E.* calls *ἐμπόριον νόμιμον*. It will be plain from what has been said that this cannot be so. Ptolemy, of course, contains many more place-names than *Periplus M.E.* and he describes many places as *ἐμπόριον* which are not mentioned at all in *Periplus M.E.* Places which are called *ἐμπόριον* in *Periplus M.E.* are mostly (but not without exception) so called by Ptolemy. Of the three places called in *Periplus M.E.* *ἐμπόριον νόμιμον* Ptolemy does not call Adouli *ἐμπόριον* at all (which is indeed surprising), and he does not mention Apologou: Mouza alone is *ἐμπόριον* in Ptolemy. As to Kalliena, the only *ἐμπόριον ἔνθεσμον*, Ptolemy does not mention it at all. He does not use the expression *ἐμπόρια τοπικά* for the Konkan ports.

Three places are described in *Periplus M.E.* as *ἀποδεδειγμένος ὄρμος*. These are two Egyptian Red Sea ports in cap. 1, Myos Hormos and Bernikē (implicitly), and

the port of the frankincense country in the Hadramaut, Moscha Limēn, in cap. 32. This epithet means something like 'publicly proclaimed, designated, appointed, or prescribed' for some purpose. In the case of Moscha Limēn, the purpose in view was control of export of frankincense by channelling it through a prescribed port. It seems quite likely that the same purpose was in view in regard to the two named Egyptian ports (and others on the same stretch of coast). We do not seem to have much information about control of exports, export dues, or the like, from Roman Egypt, but one can hardly doubt that there was some supervision of exports, and perhaps of certain imports also: the ἀποδεδειγμένοι ὅρμους are, therefore, the prescribed ports from which export cargoes for the East might be shipped, and to which, possibly, certain imports from the East were confined.

J. A. B. PALMER.

TH

ANCIE
and th
with p
a simp
Cato r
clearly
establi
questi
genera

Th
Roma
far to
time;
this a
cians;
the co
end o
discus
many
Mr. S
his ch
so far
from
teachi
corres

Th

qu

The r
the de
Cicero
rhetor
differ
tell us
from
Cicero
was fr
is tha
thesis,

¹ 3.

² Qu

³ Top. 79

⁴ In

⁵ Part. C

⁶ 2.

⁷ Th

4599

THE THESIS IN THE ROMAN RHETORICAL SCHOOLS OF THE REPUBLIC

ANCIENT rhetoric divided the questions which concerned the orator into the definite and the indefinite, *quaestiones finitae* and *quaestiones infinitae*, the former concerned with particular persons and occasions, the latter without any such reference. To take a simple example from Quintilian, 'Should one marry?' is a *quaestio infinita*, 'Should Cato marry?' a *quaestio finita*.¹ The distinction was introduced, or at any rate first clearly formulated, by Hermagoras in the second century B.C.,² and became an established part of rhetorical theory.³ The Greek term for the indefinite, or general, question was *θέσις*; none of the various Latin equivalents used by Cicero⁴ attained general currency, and the Greek term prevailed.

The purpose of this paper is to try to discover what part the *thesis* played in the Roman rhetorical training of the Republican period. At first sight the answer is not far to seek. Seneca the elder speaks of *theses* as having been debated before Cicero's time;⁵ Quintilian tells us that the earlier orators used to improve their eloquence by this and similar exercises and that these long formed the sole method of the rhetoricians;⁶ and Suetonius mentions *thesis* as one of the exercises that were superseded by the *controversia*.⁷ Thus three ancient writers on rhetoric suggest that towards the end of the Republic there was a development from *thesis* to *controversia*, from the discussion of the general question to that of the particular case. They are followed by many modern authorities. The most recent writer on Roman rhetorical history, Mr. S. F. Bonner in his *Roman Declamations*, makes Seneca's evidence the basis for his chapter on the origin and development of declamation. Neither Mr. Bonner nor, so far as I am aware, any other writer⁸ has observed how ill this view of a development from *thesis* to *controversia* agrees with our other evidence for the history of rhetorical teaching at Rome. I hope to show that it is at least doubtful whether it really corresponds to the historical facts.

The relevant sentence of Seneca reads as follows:

declamabat autem Cicero non quales nunc controuersias dicimus, ne tales quidem quales ante Ciceronem dicebantur, quas thesis vocabant.⁹

The rest of Seneca's account need not concern us; it is enough to say that he regards the declamations of his own day as a novelty, something born after himself. When Cicero declaimed—as he did, though not in public, after the fashion of the Augustan rhetors—his themes were different from those of the new-fangled *controversia*, and different too from the *thesis* in use before his day. What they were Seneca does not tell us, but Suetonius speaks of the *veteres controuersiae*, with subjects drawn either from history or from recent occurrences,¹⁰ and we must suppose that Seneca believed Cicero to have used themes of this nature.¹¹ The development then, according to him, was from *thesis* to 'old *controversia*' and thence to the newer type. The implication is that this development took place at Rome, and the flourishing period of the *thesis*, we must suppose, was from the introduction of rhetoric to Rome in the second

¹ 3. 5. 8.

² Cic. *Inv.* 1. 8.

³ Quint. 3. 5. 5; cf. Cic. *De Or.* 1. 138; 3. 109; *Top.* 79; *Part. Or.* 4; 61; *Or.* 46; 125.

⁴ *Inv.* 1. 8; *De Or.* 2. 78; 3. 111; *Top.* 79; *Part. Or.* 4.

⁵ *Contr.* 1, pref. 12.

⁶ 2. 1. 9.

⁷ *Rhet.* 1. 5.

⁸ The point is not dealt with in Thom's *Die*

Thesis, which deals in full with the general history of the *thesis* and its place in rhetorical theory.

⁹ *Contr.* 1, pref. 12.

¹⁰ *Rhet.* 1. 5.

¹¹ But Seneca himself records that Cicero declaimed at least one *controversia* of a thoroughly 'new' type: *Contr.* 1. 4. 7.

century B.C. to the first decade of the first century, when Cicero was beginning his education.

The relevant passages in Quintilian are two from the second book:

An ignoramus antiquis hoc fuisse ad augendam eloquentiam genus exercitationis ut theses dicerent et communes locos et cetera citra complexum rerum personarumque quibus uerae fictaeque controuersiae continentur? ex quo palam est quam turpiter deserat eam partem rhetorices institutio quam et primam habuit et diu solam.¹

his fere ueteres facultatem dicendi exercuerunt assumpta tamen a dialecticis argumentandi ratione. nam fictas ad imitationem fori consiliorumque materias apud Graecos dicere circa Demetrium Phalerea institutum fere constat. an ab ipso id genus exercitationis sit inuentum ut alio quoque libro sum confessus parum comperi; sed ne ii quidem qui hoc fortissime adfirmant ullo satis idoneo auctore nituntur. Latinos uero dicendi praeceptores extremis L. Crassi temporibus coepisse Cicero auctor est; quorum insignis maxime Plotius fuit.²

To what period do Quintilian's *antiqui* and *veteres* belong?³ It is not clear whether he is referring to Greece or to Rome. If the former, his 'ancients' must belong to the classical period, that of the great Attic orators. For Quintilian himself accepted the common view that *fictae ad imitationem fori consiliorumque materiae* came in in the later fourth century, in the time of Demetrius Phalereus, and once this innovation had taken place it would no longer be true to say that *theses* and other general exercises formed the sole content of rhetoric.

If Quintilian is referring to Rome, there are two possible explanations: the first that his 'ancients' belong to the period before Plotius Gallus whose school was suppressed in 92 B.C., the second that they are the men of the Republic generally, including Cicero. The first interpretation would make Quintilian agree with Seneca. It is also perhaps supported by the reference to Plotius, to whom Quintilian appears to assign a position in Roman rhetoric similar to that of Demetrius in Greek. But it is clear that he knew no more about Plotius than he got from his source Cicero, and if he had any real grounds for supposing him the introducer of exercises on particular themes he would surely have made himself clearer. The second interpretation seems rather more likely, for to a writer of Quintilian's day the words *antiqui* and *veteres* in connexion with Roman oratory would naturally mean 'of the republican period'. In the history of oratory the dividing line came after, not before Cicero.⁴ In the *Dialogus de Oratoribus* (in spite of Aper's objections to the use of the term) 'the ancients' are the Republican orators, including Cicero. In Quintilian the line between the ancients and the moderns is not so clearly drawn; but for him too the ancients generally include Cicero.⁵ Moreover, in book 10, where he returns to the theme of the value of general exercises, he gives Cicero as an example of one who when in his prime exercised himself with *theses*,⁶ which suggests that he had Cicero in mind in book 2 when he wrote of the ancients having improved their eloquence with this type of exercise. If this was what Quintilian had in mind, he does not exactly agree with Seneca, who puts the period of the *thesis* before Cicero.

Let us now dismiss Seneca and Quintilian from our minds and consider the

¹ 2. 1. 9.

² 2. 4. 41-2. In 2. 10. 1 Quintilian speaks of declamations as *nouissime inuenta*.

³ The same question is asked by Sihler in *A.J.P.* xxiii (1902), p. 289, but apart from saying that Quintilian cannot have meant 'the Roman era of Cato or even of the Gracchi', he does not answer the question.

⁴ Cf. Tac. *Dial.* 19. 1.

⁵ *omnes ueteres et Cicero praecipue*, 9. 3. 1; cf.

4. 1. 9; 6. 3. 15; 8. 5. 1, 2; 10. 1. 43; 5. 2; 7. 14; 12. 9. 5; 10. 48; 11. 5. Sometimes, however, 'the ancients' are the pre-Ciceronian orators: 2. 5. 23; 10. 2. 17.

⁶ 10. 5. 11. The reference is presumably to the 'quaedam quasi *theses*' with which Cicero occupied himself in 49 B.C.: *Att.* 9. 4. 1; 9. 1.

Repub
we kno
it was
been in
in the
ill info
the pra
conven
reason
Atheni
at Rom
declam
sort ma
tetralo
before

The
but Po
πρὸς ὅ
recogn
on par
found
they v
hardly

Mo
in the
as we
after, t
by phi
by som
certain
educat
would

If
B.C. it
main t
teachin
teachin
rejecte
teach
describ
and as
deriue

¹ And
sible: P

² Pol
In his a
vii) Kr
schon
Raum i

³ Cic

⁶ Cic
12. 2. 25

Republican evidence. Of rhetorical education at Rome before the first century B.C. we know very little, but it is reasonable to assume that, as it was in the hands of Greeks, it was based on Greek practice. Indeed, this would have been the case even if it had been in Roman hands, for in rhetoric as in other branches of thought Rome followed in the footsteps of Greece. Of Greek methods at this time we are unfortunately very ill informed. We have seen that in Quintilian's day there was general agreement that the practice of debating *controversiae* and *suasoriae* (the later terms may be used for convenience's sake) began in the time of Demetrius of Phalerum, and there seems no reason to doubt this tradition.¹ It is probable enough that with the decline of the Athenian city-state a process took place similar to that which can be clearly observed at Rome when the Augustan system replaced the Republican. The rise of school declamation coincided with the decline of the oratory of real life. Something of the sort may well have existed even earlier: the idea of the declamation is implicit in the tetralogies of Antiphon, dating from the earliest days of rhetoric, a century or so before Demetrius.

There is little evidence for Greek practice in the third and second centuries B.C., but Polybius' reference to Timaeus making his characters speak *ὡς ἂν εἰ τις ἐν διατριβῇ πρὸς ὑπόθεσιν ἐπιχειροίη*² certainly suggests that *controversiae* and *suasoriae* were a recognized institution in his day. If, then, contemporary Greek rhetoric used exercises on particular rather than on general themes, it is unlikely that the Greek rhetors who found their way to Rome adopted a different method. It is especially unlikely that they would introduce a kind of teaching based on abstract themes, which would hardly commend their discipline to the practical Roman.

Moreover, the first rhetorician to claim *theses* as part of rhetoric was Hermagoras in the middle of the second century B.C.³ His claim created something of a sensation, as we can judge from the fact that Posidonius thought it worth while, many years after, to treat Pompey to a lecture on the subject.⁴ The claim was contested not only by philosophers like Posidonius but also, as we can see from Cicero's *De Inventione*,⁵ by some rhetoricians. Hermagoras' claim could hardly have been made, and would certainly not have aroused such interest, if *theses* were already the staple of rhetorical education, and even if his view had been generally accepted, it is unlikely that it would have influenced educational practice at once.

If general questions had any place in rhetorical teaching in the second century B.C. it would be in the teaching of philosophically minded rhetoricians outside the main tradition. *Theses* were, or had been, a feature of both Academic and Peripatetic teaching,⁶ and it is these schools that we might expect to find using them in rhetorical teaching.⁷ But at the time with which we are concerned both schools, it seems, rejected rhetoric. Philo, Cicero's master, appears to have been the first Academic to teach rhetoric;⁸ before him the school maintained its founder's hostility. Cicero describes how in 107 B.C. the leading Academics of the day attacked the rhetoricians,⁹ and as they were all pupils of Carneades, it is highly probable that their attitude derived from him.¹⁰ Carneades' colleague in the famous embassy to Rome of 155 B.C.,

¹ Another tradition makes Aeschines responsible: Philostratus, *Vit. Soph.* 1, p. 481.

² Pol. 12. 25^a. 5. See Kroll, P.W., s.v. 'Melete'. In his article 'Rhetorik' (P.W. Supplementband vii) Kroll writes of declamations 'sie nahmen schon in hellenistischer Zeit einen breiten Raum im Schulbetrieb ein' (§ 38).

³ Cic. *Ino.* 1. 8. ⁴ Plut. *Pomp.* 42. ⁵ Lc.

⁶ Cic. *De Or.* 3. 107; *Or.* 46; *Tusc.* 2. 9; Quint. 12. 2. 25; D.L. 5. 3.

⁷ Borneque, *Les Déclamations et les Déclamateurs d'après Sénèque le Père*, p. 41, believes that *theses* were introduced by the Academics and Peripatetics. He suggests that Molo of Rhodes introduced *controversiae* to Rome.

⁸ *De Or.* 3. 110; *Tusc.* 2. 9.

⁹ *De Or.* 1. 45 f.; cf. Sext. *Emp. adv. Math.* 2. 20.

¹⁰ von Arnim, *Dio von Prusa*, p. 89; Kroll, *Rhetorik*, § 20.

the Peripatetic Critolaus, was also a bitter opponent of rhetoric,¹ and his hostility was perpetuated in the next generation by his pupil Diodorus.² It is thus extremely unlikely that there was any Academic or Peripatetic school of rhetoric at Rome before the time of Cicero's youth, when Philo began to teach rhetoric. It should be added that we do not even know that Philo used the *thesis*. Cicero's evidence indeed suggests that he kept his philosophy and his rhetoric apart, and in the latter followed traditional methods, including *controversiae*.³ When we turn from the second to the early part of the first century B.C. we find more evidence. The oldest Latin treatises on rhetoric, *Ad Herennium* and *De Inventione*, both of which in all probability date from the second decade of the century, are *artes*, expositions of the Greek system of formal rhetoric, but are none the less closely connected with school teaching, and give us some hints as to the methods adopted. It is generally assumed that *ad Herennium* bears some relation to the teaching of Plotius Gallus and the *Latini rhetores*.⁴ Cicero, we know, was prevented from hearing Plotius,⁵ and in spite of the similarities between the two treatises, his *De Inventione* represents a somewhat different tradition of teaching, more Greek and more academic, than that of *Ad Herennium*. But, as the two treatises show, the *thesis* played no part, or at least no important part, in either tradition.

Ad Herennium makes no mention of the *thesis*, under that name or any other. The absence of any such mention may not prove conclusively that *theses* were excluded from the curriculum of the school whose teaching the treatise reflects, but it does indicate that if they were included they played a very minor part. On the other hand, *controversiae* and *suasoriae* were evidently practised; this is implied by the reference to the necessity of *exercitatio* in connexion with particular types of case,⁶ and by the many themes referred to by way of example in the course of the treatise, which were clearly the subject of school declamation.⁷

Cicero's *De Inventione* is at least conscious of the existence of *thesis*, though the word is not actually used. Near the beginning of the work Cicero introduces us to the distinction, unknown to *Ad Herennium*, between the general and the particular question. He quotes Hermagoras as having divided the subject-matter of rhetoric into *causa* and *quaestio*, the particular and the general, but he decisively rejects Hermagoras' view. The *quaestio* (*θέσις*), is, he says, outside the orator's province and belongs to the philosopher.⁸ If, as Quintilian says,⁹ Cicero in *De Inventione* was only repeating what he had been taught, it is clear that the *thesis* had no place in the teaching of his masters. It should be remembered that these masters were the Greeks whom Crassus in *De Oratore* praises as having more general culture than the Latin rhetoricians,¹⁰ and whom one would expect, if the tradition of the development from *thesis* to *controversia* is correct, to have kept up the older method. In fact it is clear that their method, no less than that of the *Latini rhetores*, was based on the *controversia*. For no doubt they made their pupils practise, and the nature of the practice can be inferred from the specimen cases, complete with treatment, given in book 2. All these are on particular rather than on general themes. Though some are without any specific historical or geographical setting, it may be said of them, as of the cases in *Ad Herennium* (some of which indeed coincide with those of *De Inventione*), that they belong to the class of Suetonius' *veteres controversiae*.

¹ Sext. Emp. *adv. Math.* 2. 12; cf. Critolaus und die Rhetorik in Philodemus, *Rhet.*, ed. Sudhaus, suppl.

² *De Or.* 1. 45.

³ 'instituit alio tempore rhetorum praecepta tradere, alio philosophorum': *Tusc.* Lc. 'apud Philonem . . . etiam harum iam causarum [i.e. particular as opposed to general questions] cognitio exercitatioque celebratur': *De Or.* 3. 110.

⁴ Marx, *Ad Herennium*, p. 147; Schanz-Hosius, *Geschichte der röm. lit.* i, p. 210; Gwynn, *Roman Education*, ch. 5.

⁵ Suet. *Rhet.* 2.

⁷ Marx, *Ad Herennium*, pp. 102 f.

⁸ 1. 8.

¹⁰ *De Or.* 3. 94; cf. Suet. *Rhet.* 2.

⁶ e.g. 2. 12.

⁹ 3. 6. 59.

Th
Orator
Cases
work
of eas
ascend
him.³
is evid
91 B.C.
unlike
have g
negati
school
in qui
that t
and P
questi

As
De In
orator
develo
been c
was st
altoge
more
torium
enjoye
to the
that h
broad
one be
cular
of this
of rhet

It
rhetor
provin
the cla
with t

¹ De

³ Id.

⁵ Id.

not as
places
classes
of cert
general
ways, s
desirab
the lat
thesis.
tion Ci
fusion.

That *controversiae* were debated in the Republican schools is confirmed by *De Oratore*. Crassus approves the practice of debating cases similar to those of the forum.¹ Cases involving the letter versus the spirit of the law were, we are told elsewhere in the work, a regular part of the school curriculum.² We are given an example of the sort of easy case that was set as an exercise to the young: 'The law forbids a foreigner to ascend the walls; he does so and drives off the enemy. An action is brought against him.'³ If we can believe Cicero's claim that he did not indulge in anachronism,⁴ this is evidence that the *controversia* was established at the dramatic date of the dialogue, 91 B.C. Even if we cannot trust Cicero not to introduce anachronisms, it is at least unlikely that, if the *controversia* was a recent innovation in 91 B.C., Cicero would not have given some indication to that effect in the course of the work. Apart from this negative evidence there is in a passage in book 3 an indication that the rhetorical schools of that date knew nothing of *theses*, where, speaking of 'ancipites disputationes in quibus de universo genere in utramque partem disseri copiose licet',⁵ Cicero says that this type of exercise is now considered the peculiar property of the Academics and Peripatetics. Orators ought to have the power to speak on both sides on general questions, but the implication is that they have not got it.

As Cicero grew older he moved a long way from the point of view of his early *De Inventione*. He came to hold not only that general questions were within the orator's sphere, but that all questions could and should be related to them.⁶ This development was the result of his own mature thought and study; his training had been on different lines. He himself makes this clear in a letter of 54 B.C. His nephew was studying under a rhetorician called Paetonius, of whose methods Cicero did not altogether approve. His own method, he says, is *paulo eruditius et θεωρώτερον* (i.e. more concerned with general questions); that of Paetonius is described as *declamatorium*, and evidently involved declamation on *quaestiones finitae*. The young Cicero enjoyed this teaching, and his uncle did not like to intervene. He himself, he writes to the boy's father, had been brought up on the method of Paetonius, and he hoped that his nephew would develop in the same way as he himself had done towards a broader outlook.⁷ In the *Brutus*, too, he claims that his style was unique and that no one before him had been able to move from a specific question concerned with particular persons and occasions to a question of a general nature.⁸ Whatever the justice of this claim, he could hardly have made it if *theses* had been not long before the staple of rhetorical education at Rome.

It is clear from Cicero's works that the *thesis* had at best an insecure place in the rhetorical system of the day. Hermagoras had claimed it as part of the orator's province, but he and the rhetoricians who followed him did nothing to implement the claim.⁹ Their books, as Charmadas the Academic pointed out, continued to deal with the small beer of technical rhetoric and ignored the great themes.¹⁰ They made

¹ *De Or.* 1. 149.

² *Id.* 1. 244.

³ *Id.* 2. 100.

⁴ *Id.* 2. 8-9.

⁵ *Id.* 3. 107. Cicero here classes such questions not as *thesis* but as commonplace. Commonplaces were conventionally divided into two classes: (i) disquisitions on the heinousness of certain notorious sins and sinners, and (ii) general questions which can be argued both ways, such as the credibility of witnesses and the desirability of believing rumours (*Inv.* 2. 48). In the latter sense commonplace clearly borders on *thesis*. But in the passage of *De Oratore* in question Cicero seems to be guilty of a certain confusion. He speaks of this form of commonplace

in terms much more appropriate to *thesis*, for commonplace always belonged to rhetoric, and in its second sense was confined to certain stock questions closely related to forensic practice. The confusion between the second type of commonplace and *thesis* was cleared up when definitions of commonplace confined themselves to the first type. See Hermogenes (Rabe) 25. 13.

⁶ *Id.* 2. 134; *Or.* 45.

⁷ *Q.F.* 3. 3. 4.

⁸ *Brut.* 322. Cf. *Or.* 45, where the outstanding orator who refers from the particular to the general is contrasted with the *vulgaris orator*.

⁹ See Thom, *Die Thesis*, p. 95.

¹⁰ *De Or.* 1. 85, 86.

no attempt to deal thoroughly with *quaestiones infinitae*;¹ they merely mentioned them at the beginning of their text-books and claimed them for the orator, but did no more.² The average text-book on rhetoric, then, had virtually nothing to say about *theses*; it may have mentioned them in connexion with an academic classification, but it gave no precepts for handling them. This *mirum silentium*, as Cicero calls it, is hardly explicable except on the assumption that *theses* were never to any important extent a part of rhetorical teaching.

There is a partial exception to the silence in the *Partitiones Oratoriae*. This was written for the benefit of Cicero's son, and professes to give the Academic theory of rhetoric.³ Here if anywhere we should expect to find something of the *θεωρώμενον γένος*. And in fact we do find some attempt to handle *theses*. There is a full analysis of the different types of *quaestio infinita*,⁴ and specific directions as to the handling of this type of *quaestio*.⁵ But they do not amount to much; we are merely told that the precepts for the *quaestio finita* will apply to the *infinita*. By far the greater part of the work covers, in a somewhat novel fashion, the familiar ground, and leaves us with the impression that the Academics, though they gave rather more attention to *thesis* than the non-philosophical rhetoricians, did not go far enough to make any significant change in rhetorical teaching. In any case Academic rhetoric, apart from its most distinguished adherent Cicero, had little influence.⁶ Much the same applies to the *Topica*, which similarly contains an analysis of different types of *thesis*, and some directions as to the topics for such questions.⁷ The average rhetorician, as Trebatius found, was quite ignorant of the Aristotelian doctrine which the *Topica* professes to reproduce.⁸

We have still to consider the evidence of Suetonius in the passage referred to at the beginning of this paper, a passage which stands somewhat apart from those of Seneca and Quintilian and introduces new considerations. After describing the introduction of rhetoric to Rome, Suetonius goes on:

sed ratio decendi nec una omnibus nec singulis eadem semper fuit, quando uario modo quisque discipulos exercuerunt. nam et dicta praeclare per omnes figuras, per casus, et apologos aliter atque aliter exponere, et narrationes cum breuiter ac presse tum latius et uberius explicare consueuerant; interdum Graecorum scripta conuertere, ac uiros illustres laudare uel uituperare; quaedam etiam ad usum communis uitae instituta tum utilia et necessaria tum perniciose et superuacanea ostendere, saepe fabulis fidem firmare aut demere, quod genus *θέσις* et *ἀνασκευάς* et *κατασκευάς* Graeci uocant; donec sensim haec exoluerunt et ad controuersiam uentum est.⁹

The exercises referred to by Suetonius are (i) a form of the *chria*, in which a memorable saying was 'declined';¹⁰ (ii) *apologi* or fables; (iii) *narrationes*, stories from the poets or from history; (iv) translation from the Greek; (v) praise and blame of famous men; (vi) *theses*, the discussion of general questions, with arguments for and against; (vii) *ἀνασκευή* and *κατασκευή*, discussions of the credibility of stories, poetical and historical. All these exercises, with the exception of translation, are included in the *Progymnasmata* of the later Greek rhetoricians Theon, Aphthonius, and pseudo-

¹ 'de altera parte dicendi [i.e. *quaestiones infinitae*] mirum silentium est.' *De Or.* 2. 78; Sihler in *A.J.P.* xxxiii (1902), p. 290.

² *De Or.* 3. 110. The interpretation of this passage is notoriously difficult, but there is little doubt that the rhetoricians are referred to in this sentence.

³ *Part. Or.* 139. ⁴ *Id.* 61-7. ⁵ *Id.* 9; 68.

⁶ Kroll, *Rhetorik*, § 24.

⁷ *Top.* 87-90.

⁸ *Id.* 2-3. The analysis of *theses* in *De Or.* 3. 111-19, similar to that in *Part. Or.* and *Top.*, is awkwardly introduced and evidently not a part of accepted doctrine.

⁹ Suet. *Rhet.* 1. 5. The text is that of Robinson, Paris, 1925.

¹⁰ See Quint. 1. 9. 4, 5, with Colson's notes. For an example of this sort of *chria* see Diomedes (Keil) i, p. 310.

Hermogenes. They are also found, with the same exception, in Quintilian's account of the preliminary studies of the orator at the end of his first book and the beginning of his second. The *chria* and the fable are assigned by him to the *grammaticus*; *narrationes* he would have shared by the *grammaticus* and the *rhetor*; while the last three exercises in Suetonius' list he assigns to the *rhetor*.¹

In Quintilian's day the rhetorical schools, at any rate the Latin ones, had abandoned such exercises and concentrated on declamation.² Subjects which once formed the first stage of the rhetorical education now formed the final stages in the school of literature.³ Thus the *progymnasmata* had become concentrated in the hands of the *grammaticus* and had become obsolete in the rhetorical schools. In view of the fact that the *progymnasmata* were apparently flourishing in his day we can hardly suppose Suetonius to mean that they disappeared completely when the *controversia* came in. Presumably he refers to the same process that Quintilian describes, namely, the transference of these exercises from the rhetorical schools to the *grammatici*.

The date at which the *progymnasmata* were established is not known, but perhaps the most likely date is the second century B.C.⁴ Traces of some of them (though not of the *thesis*) have been found in *Ad Herennium*,⁵ and there seems no reason to doubt Suetonius' evidence that they were used by some teachers in Republican Rome. But if our interpretation of Suetonius is right, they never occupied the whole of the rhetorician's syllabus: they were always preliminary to declamation, which later pushed them out of the curriculum. In any case the *thesis*, with which we are concerned, was only one of a number of progymnastic exercises, seven in Quintilian's list, more in those of the Greek progymnasmatis, so that it could never have played a very important part. Indeed, I am inclined to doubt whether the *progymnasmata* were ever at all firmly established in Republican Rome. They were designed as a system, and in the early days at Rome there was nothing in the nature of an educational system.⁶ They must often have been squeezed out owing to premature specialization, which was not unknown in Cicero's day as well as in Quintilian's. Cicero's nephew was declaiming under Paeonius at the age of thirteen, shortly after having left the charge of the grammarian Tyrannio.⁷ There could have been little opportunity in his case for a course in the *progymnasmata*.

It seems, then, that the *thesis* had at best a very limited place in Republican teaching. It was probably used by some teachers as a progymnastic exercise. Apart from that the Republican evidence suggests that, so far from there having been a development from *thesis* to *controversia*, the *controversia* was an established method of education from the earliest days of Roman rhetoric. The *thesis* probably played some part in the teaching of the Academics, when their old attitude of hostility towards rhetoric was abandoned, but *Partitiones Oratoriae* shows what a small part it played even with them. How then, it may be asked, did the misconceptions of Seneca and Quintilian arise? Seneca perhaps is not an altogether reliable authority for matters outside his experience. He came from Spain; between him and Cicero were the civil wars, and the rhetoricians of his generation had little contact with earlier traditions. Quintilian with his wide knowledge of rhetorical history ought to be reliable, but he quotes no authority, and he may have been misled by trusting to prevailing belief. The prevailing belief may have been due in part to the influence of the Ciceronian theory that all particular questions can be referred to general questions. The latter, according to this view, are prior logically, and this supposed logical priority may have given

¹ *Chria*, Quint. l.c.; *apologi*, i. 9. 2; *narrationes*, i. 9. 6; 2. 4. 2 f.; praise and blame, 2. 4. 20; *theses*, 2. 4. 24; ἀπακνή and κατακνή 2. 4. 18.

² Quint. 2. 1. 1 f.

³ Quint. 2. 1. 3.

⁴ See Barwick in *Hermes*, lxxiii (1928), p. 283; P.W., s.v. 'Theon'.

⁵ Marx, *Ad Herennium*, pp. 110 f.

⁶ Suet. *Rhet.* 1. 5; *Gramm.* 4.

⁷ *Q.F.* 3. 3. 4; 2. 4. 2.

rise to the belief in their historical priority. Moreover, Cicero had held the view that the discussion of general questions had formed part of the original all-embracing oratorical education: 'apud antiquos erat eorum a quibus omnis de rebus forensibus dicendi ratio et copia petebatur'.¹ Cicero's *antiqui* belong to the days before Socrates, with whom the breach between philosophy and rhetoric is alleged to have begun.² This tendentious interpretation may be the origin of the passages in Seneca and Quintilian with which we are concerned. Perhaps, too, they owe something to the familiar tendency to idealize the past. The schoolmasters were bewailing the spread of early specialization.³ Believing in the virtues of a general education, they fostered the legend that it was by such an education that the great orators of the past had been formed.⁴ The legend was the more readily believed at a time when the energies of masters and pupils alike were absorbed by frivolous declamations and there was a general feeling abroad that oratory had declined.

M. L. CLARKE.

UNIVERSITY COLLEGE OF NORTH WALES,
BANGOR.

¹ *De Oratore* 3. 107.

² *Id.* 3. 60-1.

³ In Quintilian's day the Greek rhetoricians were better in this respect than the Latin, but his complaints are echoed by Theon, probably

his contemporary: *Prog.* 1.

⁴ There was, of course, truth in this, but the old general education was obtained outside the rhetorical schools, not inside them.

So H
addit
γ' is f
W
seems
notes
mean
appan
Coul
trans
Oisea
schol
as m
And
only
postu
sense
βληθ
N
Starl
suita
leg u
times
much
in a
at V
it at
σκελ
dime
by v
of th
the m
the a

E
sion
seen

TWO NOTES ON THE TEXT OF ARISTOPHANES

Wasps, 1490-2

Φι. πτήσσει Φρύνιχος ὥς τις ἀλέκτωρ—

Ξα. τάχα βαλλήσεις.

Φι. σκέλος οὐράνιον γ' ἐκλακτίζων.

1490 πτήσσει] πλήσσει Bentr. 1491 βαλλήση R: βαλλήσει Dind.

So Hall and Geldart's text and critical note. The latter needs a correction and an addition: R gives βαλλήση (so, too, Σ^R, which has βαλλήση: ἀντί τοῦ βληθήση—νικηθήση); γ' is found only in B and the Aldine edition, R and V omit it.

What is the object of βαλλήσεις? Van Leeuwen² says 'mente suppl. με', which seems to me inconsequent if not nonsensical. Starkie, printing a dash after the word, notes 'as the sentence is interrupted by Philocleon, it is impossible to know what was meant to be the object of this verb'. This does not seem very satisfactory. Rogers apparently takes the verb as used absolutely and translates 'you'll strike by and by'. Coulon, not unnaturally dissatisfied with these explanations, reads βαλλήσει and translates 'tu vas te faire lapider', adding a note 'on jetai des pierres aux fous; cf. *Oiseaux* 524'. Starkie also mentions this possibility and attributes its origin to the scholiast—wrongly, for the gloss νικηθήση shows that the scholiast did not take βαλλήση as meaning 'will be pelted as a madman'. In any case all this is very far-fetched. And there is a further point: the strange future active, βαλλήσω, is found elsewhere only at line 222 of this same play and nowhere else in Greek. It is therefore rash to postulate an entirely unparalleled middle form of this, and that, too, in a passive sense. Had he intended this meaning Aristophanes would surely have written βληθήσει.

Now the γε of l. 1492, uncritically accepted by the Oxford text, is highly suspicious. Starkie calls it 'mere surplusage', and Meineke was apparently so moved by its unsuitability to the passage that he strangely suggested reading οὐράνιον ('kicking my leg up like a ball'). Further, the scribe of B and the editor of the Aldine had, sometimes together and sometimes independently, a keen eye for the unmetrical and not much conscience in emendation; as a result of which they were in the habit of slipping in a γε if by that means they could mend a piece of faulty metre. B did so possibly at *Vesp.* 1029 and certainly at ib. 202 (where he was followed by Ald.), and Ald. did it at *Ach.* 294 and 1023. By reversing the order of the two words and reading οὐράνιον σκέλος we can restore the metre without introducing γε. (Two opening dactyls in a dimeter anapaestic system are rare; but see Ar. *Av.* 403.) The same result is effected by van Leeuwen², who gives βαλλήσεις. | ἐκλακτίζω σκέλος οὐράνιον. If we make either of these transpositions we can then write in the line above, without really altering the manuscripts' reading, τάχα βαλλήσει σ', thus securing a much needed object for the active future.

Acharnians, 1150-1

Ἀντίμαχον τὸν Ψακάδος †τὸν ξυγγραφεὶ† τὸν μελέων ποιητήν,
ὥς μὲν ἀπλῶ λόγῳ, κακῶς ἐξολέσειεν ὁ Ζεὺς.

τῶν μελέων R

Editors have rightly criticized the meaning of ξυγγραφεὶ ('prose-writer', 'commissioner') as unsuitable, and its form (-φεῖ for -φέα) as un-Attic. None, since Paley, has seen that the metre is at least suspect. In the corresponding line of the antistrophe

(1162) the foot answering to τὸν ξυγγραφῆ is καθ' ἑτερον. Never in all the aeolic lines of Aristophanes does a choriamb correspond with a third epitrite—though in one case, and in one (apparently indisputable) case only,¹ it does with a real diiamb. This is *Lys.* 326 = 340, where it is to be observed that the choriamb occurs in the strophe and the diiamb in the antistrophe.

To remove the offending word, as Elmsley did, is merely arbitrary. How did it get there? Surely not as a gloss. And to write in its place τὸν μέλεον (with R's τῶν μελέων) is to introduce a fresh difficulty; for in post-Homeric Greek (and certainly in Aristophanes) μέλεος does not mean 'good-for-nothing', but 'unhappy'. The translation 'the wretched poet of the songs' sounds all right, because the English word 'wretched', unlike the Greek word μέλεος, can mean 'good-for-nothing' as well as 'unhappy'. Elmsley's idea that there is a play upon the words μέλος and μέλεος is not strengthened by an appeal to Antiphanes fr. 209,

οἱ νῦν δὲ κισσόπλεκτα καὶ κρηναῖα καὶ
ἀνθεσιπτότατα μέλεα μέλεος δνόμασιν
ποιούσιν ἐμπλέκοντες ἀλλότρια μέλη,

where Kock notes: 'μέλεα epitheton est, non substantivum'. True, the exact meaning and construction of this passage is obscure; but μέλεα = 'songs' would certainly be odd, particularly with the normal form μέλη in the next line.

The notion—derived from the scholia—of Starkie and the Oxford editors that ξυγγραφέα means 'introducer <of a ψήφισμα to make personal attacks in comedy illegal>' is too reminiscent of Lord Burleigh's nod to demand serious criticism; and passing over such unlikely emendations as Tyrrell's τὸν ξυρίαν we may say that it was Herwerden² who first shot a beam into the darkness by suggesting ξυρραφέα, 'botcher'—a word which is to be found in a scholium on *Nub.* 446, and can be illustrated by a comparison with Aristophanes' own ῥακιοσυρραπτάδης in *Ran.* 842. But even if we accept it, as I feel we should, two difficulties remain: (1) unless we believe Rogers's strange theory that the article is omitted 'by way of contempt', we must have a τὸν before it, and for this there is no room, (2) neither 'botcher, the poet of songs' (reading ξυρραφέα, τὸν μελέων ποιητήν), nor 'botcher of the songs, poet' (reading ξ. τῶν μ., ποιητήν), nor yet 'botcher, poet of the songs' (ξ., τῶν μ. π.) is satisfactory.

Now ξυρραφεὺς μελέων is not a simple expression, and what better word could a glossator use wherewith to explain it than ποιητής? I suggest, therefore, that we regard ποιητήν as an intrusive gloss and, with a little rearrangement of words, read

Ἀντίμαχον, τὸν Ψακάδος, τὸν μελέων ξυρραφέα — —

For the missing bacchius we might read ποιηρῶν in the sense of 'rubbishy'—the sense μελέων was supposed to have but has not. Compare *Nub.* 542 ποιηρὰ σκώμματα. If ξυρραφέα ποιηρῶν was in the original and ποιητήν appeared in the margin a scribe might well have taken what was meant for a gloss as a correction and so substituted ποιητήν for the not very dissimilar in form ποιηρῶν.

M. PLATNAUER.

BRASENOSE COLLEGE,
OXFORD.

¹ Most modern editors accept Porson's δεῖ τι μέν οὐ, l. 632). Another doubtful place is *Nub.* 955 = 1030.

² *Vindiciae aristophaneae*, p. 15.

THE LAW OF LIBEL AT ROME¹

THE development of the law of libel at Rome during the second and first centuries B.C. is important for an understanding of the changing attitude on the part of society towards public criticism. This article attempts to trace the development from Naeuius to Augustus, by bringing together the scattered references in our literary and legal sources, and, by setting them in their historical perspective, to make the attitude of society towards criticism more easily discernible.

According to Cicero the Twelve Tables made the singers and authors of slanderous songs liable to the death penalty. The words are as follows: 'nostrae contra duodecim tabulae cum perpaucae res capite sanxerunt, in his hanc quoque sciendam putaverunt, si quis occentavisset sive carmen condidisset, quod infamiam faceret flagitiumve alteri'.² Cicero's statement has been challenged by scholars, who maintain that the Twelve Tables spoke only of magical spells and incantations,³ and that Cicero and Horace mistakenly supposed that they were 'malicious songs'.⁴ E. Fraenkel rejected this theory,⁵ and he has been followed by Jolowicz⁶ and Momigliano.⁷ Fraenkel's arguments are, in the present writer's opinion, cogent and convincing; he shows that Cicero's words *si quis . . . flagitiumve alteri* are probably a direct quotation from the Tables; that *sive carmen condidisset* cannot be taken as an explanation of *occantavisset*,⁸ that *occantare* is not a synonym for *incentare* and does not mean the same thing,⁹ and that in the society of the fifth century such a law was understandable and necessary.¹⁰ In these circumstances he sees no reason to doubt the truth of Cicero's words and Cicero's understanding of them. It is in any case *a priori* most improbable that Cicero, one of the leading legal figures of his time, who had in his boyhood learnt the Tables by heart,¹¹ should have completely misunderstood the meaning of this law, and that in this misunderstanding he should have been joined by the whole legal fraternity of his time; and that the jurists should have been so deceived as to the true meaning of *occantare* as to define it as *quod nunc convivium fecerit dicimus*.¹²

¹ I am indebted to Professor F. E. Adcock, who read this article and made many suggestions and corrections.

² *De Rep.* 4. 11; cf. *Tusc.* 4. 4. I deal very briefly with this problem, since the arguments on both sides are admirably summarized by Brecht, P.W. s.v. 'Occentatio', cols. 1752-60; cf. Riccobono, *Fontes iuris Romani antejustiniani*, i, pp. 52-3.

³ Horace, *Sat.* 2. 1. 82; Pliny, *Nat. Hist.* 28. 17: 'quid? non et legum ipsarum in duodecim tabulis verba sunt: qui fruges excantassit, et alibi: qui malum carmen incantassit?'

⁴ Huvelin, *Mélanges Appleton*, 1903, pp. 475 ff.; Maschke in *Studien zur Erläuterung des bürgerlichen Rechts*, 10. Heft, 1903, pp. 11 ff.; Beckmann, *Zauberei und Recht in Roms Frühzeit*; Pugliesi, *Studi sull' 'iniuria'*, pp. 22 ff. Cf. also L. Robinson, *Freedom of Speech in the Roman Republic*, pp. 3 ff.

⁵ *Gnomon*, 1925, pp. 185 ff.

⁶ *Historical Introduction to the Study of Roman Law*, 1932, p. 175.

⁷ *J.R.S.* xxxii, 1942, p. 121.

⁸ Cf. also Stolz-Schmalz, *Lateinische Grammatik*, 1926, p. 779, para. 344; and cf. p. 677, para. 250.

⁹ For a discussion of the meaning of *occantare* see also Usener, *Rh. Mus.* lvi, 1901, p. 3; Hendrickson, *Class. Phil.* xx, 1923, pp. 289-308; *Hermes*, lxi, 1926, pp. 79-86.

¹⁰ Against the suggestion that Augustine has changed the Ciceronian text see Fraenkel, op. cit., pp. 189 ff. Robinson's suggestion, op. cit., p. 3, that *quod infamiam faceret* has been added to explain *carmen condidisset* is *per se* most unsatisfactory, because *carmen* alone would require further definition in the original law. On her interpretation it must have read *malum carmen* (cf. Pliny, *Nat. Hist.* 18. 17), and there is no point in anyone's deleting *malum* to substitute *quod infamiam faceret*.¹¹ *De Legibus* 2. 59.

¹² Festus 181 M. See Fraenkel, loc. cit., p. 193. T. Frank, *A.J.P.* xlvi, 1927, p. 108, rejects Fraenkel's interpretation; but it cannot be said that he shows any reason for the rejection.

With one possible exception the law does not seem to have been operative in the period under consideration. The exception is Naevius, and the importance of his case for our purpose requires that it be examined. We are told by Gellius¹ that Naevius wrote two plays in prison whither he had been committed 'ob assiduum maledicentiam et probra in principes civitatis de Graecorum more dicta'. The only extant example of such criticism is quoted by Gellius,² which he tells us referred to Scipio Africanus.³ The reference is oblique, since Scipio is not mentioned by name. Some scholars⁴ maintain that his well-known line on the Metelli—*Fato Metelli Romae fiunt consules*—is a senarius from one of his comedies, but against this Marmorale raises certain objections,⁵ and holds it to be a saturnian line from his *Bellum Punicum*.

On what charge was Naevius imprisoned? Marx,⁶ following Niebuhr, thought that he was held in *libera custodia*; Marmorale⁷ supposes that Q. Metellus, in 205 B.C. *dictator comitiorum causa dictus*, exercised his *arbitrium*, and claiming that Naevius had brought his authority into disrepute by his attacks on him, had him thrown into prison through his power of *coercitio*. Frank⁸ believed that the law of the Twelve Tables was, under the stress of war, invoked for political purposes and twisted from its proper sense of 'magical incantations' to cover the case of slander. We must remember that, the formal play being new to Rome, there was no legislation for its proper conduct, nor, until this moment, any need of such. Naevius' introduction of oblique criticisms of the governing class introduced an element into the play which must have displeased an aristocracy that believed itself immune from criticism except from one of its number. It is not surprising that his victims looked for some legal means of silencing him. Before we attempt to decide by what authority he was committed to prison we must reflect on two important facts: first, that the tradition nowhere suggests that Naevius was helped in his difficulties by his noble friends. Yet if his enemies had behaved in an unconstitutional manner, such help would surely have been forthcoming; and the presumption is that his enemies had the law on their side. Secondly, Naevius seems to have been the first and the last Roman dramatist known to have indulged in political criticism from the stage.⁹ The inference is that later dramatists feared the legal consequences of such conduct. Since there is no evidence of any law having been passed as an immediate consequence of Naevius' behaviour, the inference is that the law was already in existence; and that law we may with Frank most reasonably identify with that of the Twelve Tables; which, while it had not been framed to check criticism from the stage, could with some show of reason be interpreted to cover such criticism.¹⁰

¹ 3. 3. 15.

² Id. 7. 8. 5.

³ Marmorale, *Naevius Poeta*, Catania, 1945, pp. 41–2, claims that the passage does not refer to Scipio Africanus but to his father or uncle. Kroll, *Hermes*, lxi, p. 472, followed by Rostagni, *La letteratura di Roma Repubblicana ed Augustea*, p. 73, n. 4, supposes that these verses are in praise of Scipio. Why Robinson, op. cit., p. 3, supposes they are mere rhymes composed round the camp fire I do not know.

⁴ Leo, *Sat. Vers.* 1905, p. 32; Fraenkel, in P. W. Supptbd. vi, s.v. 'Naevius', col. 623, who also refers to works by Marx and Jachmann, to which I have not access.

⁵ Op. cit., pp. 57 ff. He contends that although Gellius says de *Graecorum more*, which suggests that he did name his victims, Cicero, *De Rep.* 4. 11, seems to make it clear that he could not have done; and that although in a general way

Gellius could compare Naevius to writers of Greek comedy without being fairly accused of inaccuracy, yet the whole point of Cicero's contrast would be lost if, in fact, Naevius had named his victims; but that if Naevius contented himself with subtle allusion and indirect criticism, much of which would have been lost to later generations, then Cicero's contrast would be fair. Cf. Marmorale, op. cit., p. 40–41; Leo, *Gesch. d. röm. Lit.*, p. 77; Fraenkel, 'Naevius', col. 623; Brecht, loc. cit., cols. 1760–1.

⁶ *Ber. Sachs. Ges. d. Wiss.* lxiii, 1911, 3. Heft, p. 71.

⁷ Op. cit., pp. 106–7.

⁸ Op. cit., p. 109. He is followed by Robinson, op. cit., pp. 5–6; cf. Momigliano, op. cit., p. 122.

⁹ Cf. Robinson, op. cit., pp. 6–8; Momigliano, op. cit., p. 123.

¹⁰ Cf. Cuq in Dār.—Sagl. s.v. 'iniuria', p. 519. The Law is here understood to refer to

The
ad hoc e
dent. S
which is
in the f
he now
first to
criticize
suggest
portant
and nob
inclinat
the othe
unpunis
those o
nobles,

We
when w
writers
Luciliu
capital,
mention
to criti
criticism
the situ
the law
these p
the case
We may

defamato
incantati

¹ We r
to a situa
the law w
body of
became i
the origi
Iulia) wa
below, pp

² Teren
the intro

³ Rhet.
nominati
saena.
nihil ali
cuius nor
'Caelius
Luciliu
P. Muciu
verat, co

⁴ Cuq,
tions, to
Twelve T

⁵ Ulpia

The application of this law to dramatic criticism may have been intended as an *ad hoc* expedient to silence Naevius; but it could hardly be other than a legal precedent. Since it had not been challenged, the interpretation must stand for the future; which is what seems to have happened.¹ Naevius, so far as we know, had no successor in the field. Terence's treatment of his critics in the prologues confirms this view: he nowhere mentions them by name, and is careful to point out that they were the first to launch the attack.² If it be argued that the fact that they should dare to criticize each other at all militates against this view, the answer is twofold: first, it is suggested that the only law was that of the Twelve Tables; second, and more important, its interpretation had been applied by political persons for political purposes; and noble politicians could do things which others might not have the courage or the inclination to imitate. Probably neither Terence nor his opponents wished to remove the other from Rome; and what might draw down the anger of a Metellus would pass unpunished from a Terence. They were careful; and they confined their criticisms to those on drama; for since the precedent stood, overfree criticism might annoy some nobles, who might foresee future danger to themselves.

We next hear of criticism from the stage towards the end of the second century, when we learn that both Lucilius and Accius brought cases for damages against mime writers who had criticized them by name, and that Accius was awarded damages, Lucilius not.³ We note first that whereas under the Twelve Tables the offence was capital, now it is treated as 'iniuria';⁴ and that the mime writers are stated to have mentioned the poets by name. The defence in the case of Accius is that it is permissible to criticize fellow-dramatists. Clearly the situation has now changed; personal criticism from the stage makes the author liable to a suit for damages. This is exactly the situation envisaged in the Praetor's Edict,⁵ which seems here to be modernizing the law of the Twelve Tables.⁶ This part of the Edict would then be dated before these prosecutions, since otherwise there would have been no grounds for bringing the cases, there being no other law in existence making defamatory speech an *iniuria*. We may appreciate why the plaintiffs stressed the fact that they had been named,

defamatory songs, not, as Frank held, to magical incantations.

¹ We may compare this application of the law to a situation which did not exist at the time that the law was made with the extension of the whole body of the law of treason when the Princes became identified with the State; though, when the original legislation (*Leges Appuleia, Cornelia, Iulia*) was passed, there was no Princeps. See below, pp. 173 f.

² Terence's caution may, however, be due to the introduction of the law spoken of below.

³ *Rhet. ad Herenn.* 1. 24: 'Mimus quidam nominatim Accium poetam compellavit in scaena. cum eo Accius iniuriarum agit. hic nihil aliud defendit nisi licere nominare eum, cuius nomine scripta dentur agenda.' 2. 13. 19: 'Caelius iudex absolvit iniuriarum eum, qui Lucilium poetam in scaena nominatim laeserat, P. Mucius eum, qui L. Accium poetam nominaverat, condemnavit.'

⁴ *Cuj.* loc. cit., p. 519, thinks these prosecutions, too, were made under the law of the Twelve Tables.

⁵ Ulpian, *Dig.* 47. 10. 25: 'ne quid infamandi

causa fiat. si quis adversus ea fecerit, prout quaeque res erit, animadvertam'; this is then explained by Ulpian, para. 27: 'proinde quodcumque quis fecerit vel dixerit, ut alium infamet, erit actio iniuriarum. haec autem fere sunt, quae ad infamiam alicuius fiunt: . . . aut si carmen conscribat vel proponat vel cantet ali-quod, quod pudorem alicuius laedit'. Cf. also para. 2. Cf. *Rhet. ad Herenn.* 4. 35: 'iniuriae sunt, quae aut pulsatione corpus (aut) convicio auris aut aliqua turpitudine vitam cuiuspiam violant'.

⁶ Cf. *Cuj.* op. cit., p. 519; Mommsen, *Strafr.*, p. 795; Fraenkel, op. cit., pp. 192-4; Brecht, op. cit., col. 1762; Robinson, op. cit., p. 7, following a conjecture by Frank in an unpublished lecture, suggests that a specific law may have been passed, making criticism of anyone by name from the stage a case of *iniuria*. This seems unlikely; if there had been such a law, it is difficult to see how Caelius, even for political reasons (p. 6), could have failed to award Lucilius damages. But it might be possible to quibble one's way out under the generality of the Edict.

when we remember what Paulus' says of cases where the victim was not named. This attempt to adjust the law to the requirements of the day was natural; the growing popularity of the mime and the Atellane farce with their freer traditions and the general development of society would make some modernization of the law a necessity. It is not yet as detailed as it became under the later Republic, when criticism of all kinds, both spoken and written, had become an important element in political life; for the moment it was sufficient to protect a man's good name by this general edict, bringing all words and actions which defamed another under the scope of *iniuria*.² It is interesting to note the defence in the case of Accius; it may possibly be that the mime writer was basing his defence on the precedent of Terence and his critics.³

The First Century B.C.

By the end of the second century books and pamphlets were becoming commoner. Hitherto the reading public had been largely confined to the educated classes, the men most nearly concerned with government: criticism, to reach the public, must be by word, i.e. from the stage. From the government's point of view, therefore, there was a sharp distinction between the spoken and the written word. The treatment meted out to Naevius was an example of censorship, to prevent criticism of the governing class. Had the written word at that time had a wide circulation it, too, would certainly have come under the government's surveillance; but owing to the restricted circulation of written works and the ordinary Roman's lack of interest in politics political pamphlets were not written and hence no precautions were necessary. This distinction between the written and the spoken word is well seen in the case of Lucilius, who could bring an action against a mime writer, while at the same time in his satires he criticized many of the nobles themselves.⁴ But with the growth of individualism in politics and the emergence of the Populares, to whom the traditions of the past meant little, no means of discrediting an opponent were left untried; and among these means were pamphlets, lampoons, epigrams, and the like.⁵ This presented a problem all the more difficult because the bitterness of party politics increased the mutual vituperation. So long as neither side was dominant, both sides indulged in it; but with the dictatorship of Sulla, which was in fact the dictatorship of the nobles, the opposition was crushed and silenced.

² Dig. 47. 10. 6. This belongs to a later period, but shows the difficulty which a plaintiff would have in such circumstances.

³ Lejay, *Œuvres d'Horace, Satires*, p. 267, speaks of the words *iniuriarum egit* in the *Rhet. ad Herenn.* as an anachronism, but in what sense he does not explain. If he means that it was an *iniuria* at the time the *Rhet.* was written, but not in the time of Accius and Lucilius, he still has to show when it became *iniuria*. But on p. 286 he suggests that it was not until after the time of the *Rhet.* that criticism became an *iniuria*. In that case we can only congratulate the author of the *Rhet.* for his prescience in foreseeing the later development of Roman law. His statement that cases of *iniuria* went before *recipitatores* is not wholly true. According to Gellius, 20. 1. 13, they did (though we should note that this is physical *iniuria*; in what sense defamatory became an *iniuria*, it may have been felt that in some cases at any rate a single *iudex* would be better able to decide the issue); but certain cases could and did come before a single

iudex, as the cases under discussion prove. Cf. Gaius 3. 224. See Wenger in P.W., s.v. 'recipitatio', cols. 429-31; Steinwenter s.v. 'iniuria', col. 1557; Cuq, loc. cit., p. 523, n. 2; Girard, *Manuel élémentaire de droit romain*, p. 1009, n. 4.

⁴ Unless, as was suggested above, the law came first.

⁵ Frank, loc. cit., p. 109, fails to see this important distinction: in discussing the case of Naevius he talks of the liberty to criticize being highly valued at Rome, and then quotes as examples Lucilius, Catullus, Calvus, etc. Examples from the first century are little help in dealing with Naevius, since social customs change in 150 years. But, more important, the written word is not necessarily on the same footing as the spoken, as the case of Lucilius shows. Cf. Robinson, op. cit., p. 27.

⁶ For the increasing importance of the written word cf. Mommsen, op. cit., p. 794; v. Premerstein in P.W., s.v. 'libellus', col. 29; Pfaff, s.v. 'liber', col. 62.

We
nor can
in fact,
upon t
exam
libel of
follows

Lex
se p
in a
Si q
dolo
nom
ex l
ém
emel

The first
liceret.
the wor
should
the cons
it is an
and tha
permiss
point of
with the
good se
res se ha
clause r
any add
the elab

The
Ulpian
hac lege
the lex
would as
in the p
this pun

We
by Mom
man was

¹ Dig. 4
are Mom

² Z. Sa
adopting
I have not

³ He is

⁴ See b

⁵ The o
present po

⁶ Cf. Le
col. 62; v.

We cannot be certain of the details of Sulla's legislation *de iniuriis* and *de maiestate*; nor can we be certain that either or both of these pieces of legislation dealt with libel; in fact, the consensus of opinion among most scholars is that Sulla did not touch upon the subject. The question is of such importance for our purpose that a re-examination of the evidence may be excused. The evidence for the application to libel of the *lex de iniuriis* is to be found in Ulpian,¹ the full text of which runs as follows:

Lex Cornelia [de iniuriis] competit ei, qui iniuriarum agere volet ob eam rem, quod se pulsatum verberatumve domumve suam vi introitam esse dicat. . . . sed Sabinus in adessorio etiam praetores exemplum legis secuturos ait: et ita res se habet. Si quis librum ad infamiam alicuius pertinentem scripserit, composuerit, ediderit dolove malo fecerit, quo quid eorum fieret, etiamsi alterius nomine ediderit vel sine nomine, uti de ea re agere liceret et, si condemnatus sit qui id fecit, intestabilis ex lege esse iubetur. Eadem poena ex senatus consulto tenetur etiam is, qui ἐνυγράμματα aliudve quid sine scriptura in notam aliquorum produxerit: item qui emendum vendendumve curaverit.

The first difficulty in this passage is to explain the construction of *uti de ea re agere liceret*. On what is this clause dependent? Levy² thinks there is a lacuna, and that the words *senatus consultum cautum est* have fallen out before *uti de ea re*, that *ex lege* should be read before *agere* and deleted after *intestabilis*.³ We will deal below⁴ with the consequences of these drastic changes to the interpretation; but we may say that it is an unnecessarily elaborate addition to a text which shows no signs of a lacuna, and that if a verb were thought necessary to introduce the *uti* clause, *cautum est* or *permissum est* would be sufficient. To introduce *senatus consultum* is to prejudice the point of debate. But is any verb necessary? If the sentence be read in conjunction with the previous one, a sound Latin construction emerges, which gives perfectly good sense: 'Sed Sabinus . . . etiam praetores exemplum legis secuturos ait: et ita res se habet: si quis librum . . . ediderit, . . . uti de ea re agere liceret. . . .' The *uti* clause runs perfectly naturally after the *ita res se habet*, gives good sense, and makes any addition to the text unnecessary. For that reason it is greatly to be preferred to the elaborate alterations favoured by Levy.⁵

The next step is to identify the *lex*. Down to this point the only *lex* whose influence Ulpian has discussed is the *lex Cornelia*, which has been referred to as *lex Cornelia*, *hac lege* (para. 8), and simply *legis* (para. 9). In the context it is difficult to see how the *lex* referred to can be any other than the *lex Cornelia*; were it some other law, he would as certainly have mentioned its name as he did that of the *lex Cornelia* earlier in the passage; and since for his purpose it is necessary to know what law prescribes this punishment, it is a reasonable inference that the law is the *lex Cornelia*.⁶

We may now consider Levy's interpretation of the passage, which is accepted by Momigliano.⁷ His contention is that the *lex Cornelia* dealt only with cases where a man was *pulsatus verberatusve* or whose house was *vi introitam*.⁸ A *senatus consultum*

¹ Dig. 47. 10. 5. 8 ff. The text and punctuation are Mommsen's, revised by Krueger.

² Z. Sav. Stift. röm. Abt. I. 19. 30, p. 286, adopting a restoration by Lenel, to whose work I have not access.

³ He is here following a suggestion by Ferrini.

⁴ See below, pp. 173-4.

⁵ The objections to moving *ex lege* from its present position in the textis stated below, p. 174.

⁶ Cf. Levy, loc. cit., p. 287; Pfaff, loc. cit., col. 62; v. Premerstein, loc. cit., col. 29; Manigk,

P.W., s.v. 'intestabilis', col. 1729; Brecht, loc. cit., col. 1760; Robinson, op. cit., pp. 53-4, 59, n. 16. Mommsen, op. cit., p. 800 and n. 3, refers *lege* to the Twelve Tables. He refers also to Ulpian, Dig. 28. 1. 18. 1. For a criticism of Mommsen on this point, see below, p. 174. Cf. Levy, loc. cit., p. 287, n. 1. Robinson, op. cit., p. 51 and n. 58, wrongly says that Mommsen identifies the *lex* with the *lex Cornelia*.

⁷ Op. cit., p. 123.

⁸ Dig. 47. 10. 5, preface.

then extended the scope of the *lex Cornelia* to include cases of *carmina famosa*, which thus became objects of public as well as private lawsuits; and the *senatus consultum* added as a novelty the penalty of *intestabilitas*.¹ His reason for following Ferrini in moving *ex lege* from its present position in the text is that since, even before the passage of the *senatus consultum*, it was possible to bring a case of defamation under the Edict, the *senatus consultum* must have done something more, and he concludes that to be the addition of *carmina famosa* among the indictable offences under the *Lex Cornelia*.

In general one wonders whether the Senate would have set about their task in such a way; it was perfectly competent for the Senate to lay down detailed regulations with respect to *carmina famosa* without having to resort to the inclusion within the *Lex Cornelia* of a new category of offences, for which is then added a penalty unknown to the *lex*.² Such a suggestion is in itself unconvincing, the more so when we remember that the *senatus consultum* in this passage has been added by Levy himself.³

But an examination of the passage in *Digest*, 28. 1. 18. 1 shows that it does not support Levy's argument. It reads as follows: 'si quis ob carmen famosum damnetur, senatus consulto expressum est, ut intestabilis sit.' Here we come to a point of confusion in Mommsen's and Levy's minds; they have arbitrarily identified *liber* with *carmen*, and assumed that what is said of the one necessarily refers also to the other; that in law and common usage *liber* and *carmen* were interchangeable. In fact this was not so; *liber*, *libellus*, and *carmen* were clearly defined ideas, *libellus* and *carmen* in their scope at first approximating to one another and hence tending to come under the same regulations, *liber* being different in quality; though eventually, as Ulpian tells us, they were all punished similarly. *Carmen* was a short composition intended to be sung or spoken, even though for its propagation it might be written down; the *carmina* sung at Caesar's triumph afford us an example of their essential nature.⁴ *Libellus* was a short written composition, of probably not more than one or two sentences, which could be handed round or left lying about for someone to pick up.⁵ *Liber*, on the other hand, denoted a written composition of greater length, intended to be read rather than spoken, a book or a large pamphlet, such as Varro's *Trikaranos* or Caesar's *Anticato*.⁶ When both *libri* and *libelli* were treated similarly under the law, both words came to be used of written compositions of greater or less length.

The *senatus consultum* mentioned by Ulpian, *Dig.* 28. 1. 18. 1, is dealing with *carmen famosum*, and is distinct from the regulation dealing with *liber*. And this exactly agrees with the passage of Ulpian under discussion, where, having dealt with *liber famosus* he proceeds: 'eadem poena ex senatus consulto tenetur etiam is, qui ἐπιγράμματα aliούδε quid sine scriptura in notam alicuius produxerit; item qui emendum vendendumve curaverit.'⁷ This is the same *senatus consultum* as the one men-

¹ He refers, as does Mommsen, to *Dig.* 47. 10. 5. 10 and 28. 1. 18. 1. I coin the word *intestabilitas* for convenience.

² According to Levy, loc. cit. One might reasonably ask why the *s.c.* mentioned in the next sentence did not merely add epigrams, etc., to the *Lex Cornelia*.

³ Momigliano, op. cit., p. 123, surely goes too far in saying that the passage 'is certainly post-Sullan', referring for proof to Levy.

⁴ Suet. *Iulius* 80. 2. Note the words used by Ulpian in relation to *carmen*, *Dig.* 47. 15. 27: *conscriptat, proponat, cantet*. Cf. Fraenkel, loc. cit., p. 192.

⁵ Cf. the examples of *libellus* in Suet. *Iulius* 80.

² 'bonum factum: ne quis senatori novo curiam monstrare velit!' and *Vitellius* 14. 4: 'statim libel luspropositus est, et Chaldaeos dicere, bonum factum, ne Vitellius Germanicus intra eundem Kalendarum diem usquam esset.' Cf. *Augustus* 55: 'etiam sparsos de se in curia famosos libellos nec expavit. . . .' The fact that Suetonius could quote *libelli* shows that they could be memorized and passed by word of mouth.

⁶ Note the words used by Ulpian, loc. cit.: *scripserit, composuerit, ediderit*, and contrast them with the words used (cf. n. 4 above) with respect to *carmen*.

⁷ The last clause shows the distinction between *liber* and the other forms of composition;

tioned
other t
sentenc
consulti
the imp
his unne

We
one is
'eadem
one cas
the an
praeton
anyone
praeton
bilitas
things
in case
by the
a pena
to incl
first, it
it wou
would
basis o
stated
plum l
eadem
of per
but th
in fact
examp
with a
unders
broug
answer
develo
have s
consti
indivi
same e
tion h

even th
yet a p
for the
althoug
rather
just as
reach
'public
'*Mc*
the leg
one pro
tus, wh

tioned in *Dig.* 28. 1. 18. 1, and is concerned with possible sources of libel or slander other than the *liber*. Whatever, then, is the answer to the problem of the previous sentence in Ulpian, Levy's solution is no solution; his identification of the *senatus consultum* with this regulation relating to *liber* is wrong, and Ulpian nowhere gives the impression that *libri* were dealt with by a *s.c.*¹ He has therefore no authority for his unnecessarily drastic addition to the text.

We may now return to the text of Ulpian as it stands. The first point that strikes one is the clearly intended contrast between 'intestabilis ex lege esse iubetur' and 'eadem poena ex senatus consulto tenetur' etc. The law prescribed the penalty in the one case, a *s.c.* in the other; to move *ex lege* from its present position² is to destroy the antithesis intended by Ulpian. Ulpian's point is this: Sabinus says that the praetors also were going to follow the example of the law, which provides that if anyone writes a libellous work, etc., the victim may bring an action before the praetor, and if the author is convicted the praetor will impose the penalty of *intestabilitas* in the same way as the *Lex Cornelia* does. The *exemplum* might be one of two things: either the praetor follows the example of the *lex* in allowing a suit for *iniuria* in case of a libellous publication, and imposing the same penalty as that prescribed by the *lex*; or the praetor follows the example of the *lex* in the penalty he prescribes, a penalty in the *lex* prescribed only for physical injury, but extended by the praetor to include this *iniuria verbis*. But the second interpretation has two drawbacks: first, it leaves *uti de ea re agere liceret* without any real significance in the passage; it would have been sufficient to say that anyone convicted of a libellous publication would be punished by *intestabilitas* if a libellous publication had been an accepted basis of prosecution. The right to bring a suit under such circumstances is clearly stated by Ulpian to be one of the consequences of the praetor's following the *exemplum legis*. And second, it would make the contrast between *intestabilis ex lege* and *eadem poena ex s.c.* very artificial: the *s.c.* laid down specifically that anyone accused of perpetrating epigrams, etc., if found guilty, was to be punished by *intestabilitas*; but the *lex* would not have laid down any such thing with respect to *libri famosi*; in fact, it would not have dealt with the subject; *ex lege* would mean 'following the example of the law in the choice of penalty', while *ex s.c.* would mean 'in accordance with a *s.c.*'. For these reasons the first interpretation, which is the more natural understanding of the passage, is far preferable. And if it be argued that suits could be brought before the praetor for libellous writings, regardless of the *Lex Cornelia*,³ the answer is simple: the concept of what was later called *iniuria verbis* was in process of development, and its scope was being broadened with the development of society. We have seen in the cases of Lucilius and Accius that there was not unanimity as to what constituted abuse from the stage; that, in other words, the law protecting the individual was very general and depended on the interpretation of the judge. The same general law was still the only protection; and by now a fresh source of defamation had developed, namely a written work. Sulla dealt specifically with this source

even though they are defined as *sine scriptura*, yet a penalty is laid down for anyone responsible for their purchase or sale; the point being that although to achieve their effect they are spoken rather than read, yet they could be published—just as any song or book of jokes—in order to reach a greater audience. Note *prodixerit* = 'publicized' not 'published'.

¹ Mommsen, *op. cit.*, p. 800 and n. 3, identified the *lege* with the Twelve Tables, and the *s.c.* as one probably passed about A.D. 12 under Augustus, which revived the penalties prescribed in the

Tables for libellous writings. This is his attempt to harmonize the apparently contradictory statements of Ulpian.

² Its removal to a position next to *agere* is, of course, pointless unless one had the addition of *ex s.c. cautum est*; but in itself its removal is bad, as destroying the antithesis. Krueger conjectures *esse ea lege*; if this were accepted, it would clinch the matter.

³ As Ferrini, quoted by Levy, says, in defence of his moving *ex lege* to *agere*; see Levy, *loc. cit.*, p. 286, n. 2.

of attack on the aristocracy, and the praetors decided to follow Sulla's regulation since the Edict was not in conflict with it; and it provided the praetors with an *exemplum* for their guidance. A further development was made by the *s.c.*, which extended the scope by explicit mention of epigrams, etc.; Sulla's law had dealt only with *libri*, the first manifestation of this form of attack; the growth of other forms of attack provoked finally the *s.c.* The actual words used by Ulpian in this passage are very probably not the actual words of the *Lex Cornelia* but the legal phraseology of Ulpian's time; but it reflects the scope of the *Lex Cornelia* on this matter.

If it is difficult to be certain about Sulla's law *de iniuriis*, it is impossible to do more than hazard a conjecture about his law *de maiestate* in respect of libel and slander. The only possible reference to a regulation by Sulla in his *lex de maiestate* comes in a letter of Cicero to Appius Claudius as follows: 'De ambitu vero quid interest', inquis, 'an de maiestate? Ad rem nihil; alterum enim non attigisti, alterum auxisti. †Verum tamen est maiestas, etsi Sulla voluit, ne in quemvis impune declamari liceret; ambitus vero ita apertam vim habet ut aut accusetur improbe aut defendatur.'² The corrupt nature of the text makes precision impossible; but the general argument runs as follows: 'You ask what is the difference between prosecution for *ambitus* and for *maiestas*. In one sense none; but on the other hand *maiestas* is[?], even though Sulla wanted it (defined thus), that a person should not be able to make a public speech against any (= every) one with impunity. The scope of *ambitus*, on the other hand, is crystal clear.' The contrast in Cicero's mind is between the uncertainty or obscurity of *maiestas* and the clarity of *ambitus*; some word, therefore, meaning 'ambiguous' or 'obscure' needs to be supplied.³ It is further clear that the scope of *maiestas* is obscure in spite of Sulla's wishes, and that he had tried to make frivolous prosecutions for *maiestas* punishable. Cicero seems to be pointing out to Appius that the advantage of a prosecution for *ambitus* is that, since its scope is so clear, the prosecutor must confine himself to the charge of *ambitus*; whereas owing to the uncertainty of what constituted *maiestas*, one was liable to be the victim of a prosecution on ill-defined charges; and defence was correspondingly more difficult. Sulla wanted the definition of *maiestas* to be so precise that anyone bringing a flippant charge should be punishable. This he could have done by prescribing a penalty for anyone bringing a charge of *maiestas* not covered (presumably) by his *lex de maiestate*; possible victims would then have been protected from public attacks (*declamationes*) made under the pretext of a charge of *maiestas*. This regulation may have been embodied in his *lex de maiestate*. If it was, it failed of its purpose because his regulations with respect to *maiestas* were not accepted as the only occasions of the crime; the definition remained vague, and it was still open to a man to claim that his enemy 'de dignitate aut amplitudine aut potestate populi aliquid derogavisse'.⁴ However,

¹ *Ad Fam.* 3. 11. 2.

² Kübler in P.W., s.v. 'Maiestas', col. 547, gives a very misleading impression of the scope of Sulla's legislation on this point by giving a truncated version of this text with conjectural restorations.

³ Professor A. H. McDonald has suggested 'varia [varium? but cf. Tyrrell and Purser, 2nd ed., iii, p. 236, ad loc.] tamen est maiestas', etc. This would give a perfectly satisfactory meaning, with the added advantage of requiring only the slightest change to the text. *Varia* would mean 'uncertain' in the sense that it was not definite, and hence many things could be construed as being cases of *maiestas*.

⁴ Cic. *De Inv.* 2. 53. Momigliano, op. cit., p. 123, says that the reading in Tyrrell and Purser, 1st ed., iii. 2. 13, is the only one that gives full sense. It reads: 'ea est maiestas (etsi Sulla noluit) ut in quemvis declarari liceret'. He admits that this emendation seems far too drastic. But does it give full sense? Why is *liceret* in the imperfect instead of the present, as is *accusetur*? There can be only one reason, because the clause refers back to the trial of Appius: *maiestas* is such that it was perfectly in order for anyone to declaim against you. But the text has *quemvis*, not *te*, and it is very difficult to know what can be the meaning of this general clause in past time.

Sulla ma
constitut
victim of
protecte

The p
on a ch
magistr
aristocr
their go
charge o
by defin

Sulla
minate
or by g
But we
to a ma
time; b
the map
that th
with lib
prosecu
eviden
iniuria
have co
tracies
a *priva*
were s
Empir

Ho
asks w
carmine
This i
poets

¹ Fr
B.C. (?)
² Mo

law's
that q
been,
Cf. Kü
³ C
orient
stratu
53: 'm
ampli
bus po

⁴ C
genera
was a
Kübl
to Ad
Lex I

Sulla may not have made any special regulation in the matter; if his list of what constituted *maiestas* had been accepted as the only occasions of the crime, then the victim of a frivolous charge would have had the protection of the *Lex Remmia*, which protected persons from *calumnia*, i.e. the bringing of false charges.

The passage does suggest that Sulla tried to protect those who might be prosecuted on a charge of *maiestas*; and these persons would be magistrates or recent ex-magistrates. It is consonant with Sulla's general aim to restore the rule of the aristocracy and protect them from the attacks which had been increasingly made on their government by the *Populares* over the previous thirty years. The ill-defined charge of *maiestas* had been one of their means of attack;¹ Sulla's legislation aimed by defining the charge² at protecting the magistrate.

Sulla, then, may have tried to protect magistrates from prosecutions on indeterminate charges of *maiestas* by making the prosecutor liable to prosecution for *maiestas*, or by giving the victim through closer definition the protection of the *Lex Remmia*. But we may perhaps go farther; Quintilian makes clear that if an *iniuria* were done to a magistrate, then it became a case of *maiestas*.³ Quintilian is writing at a later time; but the definition of *maiestas* given by Cicero shows so clearly that in his time the magistrates' *dignitas* and *amplitudo* were included in that of the *populus Romanus* that the situation can hardly have been different then.⁴ If Sulla's *lex de iniuriis* dealt with libellous publications, then libels directed against a magistrate could lead to prosecutions for *maiestas*. Whether they ever did, we cannot in the absence of positive evidence say; the danger would always be there once libel had become explicitly *iniuria*, if the magistrate chose to protect himself in this way.⁵ Two causes would have conspired to limit, if not nullify, its potentialities: first, the fact that, as magistracies were annual, a libeller only had to withhold publication until his victim became a *privatus*; second, the fact that in the disintegrating conditions of society some laws were simply disregarded; luxury, bribery, and corruption, like soothsayers in the Empire, were constantly being banished and were always with them.

Horace and Augustus

Horace in *Satires* 2. 1, in an imaginary conversation with the lawyer Trebatius, asks whether he may make personal attacks in his writings. Trebatius tells him that *carmina mala*⁶ are forbidden, and that any such attack could give rise to a lawsuit.⁷ This is a different situation from that of Lucilius, different also from that of such poets as Catullus and Calvus, who did attack individuals, including those holding

¹ From the time of the *Lex Appuleia*, 103 B.C. (?).

² Momigliano, op. cit., p. 123, speaks of the law's 'notorious extension and vagueness'; is that quite fair? It was less vague than it had been, and extended only in being more definite. Cf. Kübler, op. cit., col. 547.

³ Cf. Quint. 5. 10. 39: 'hinc enim quaestiones oriuntur: . . . *Iniuriam fecisti; sed quia magistratus, maiestatis actio est.*' Cf. Cic. *De Inv.* 2. 17. 53: '*maiestatem minuire est de dignitate aut amplitudine aut potestate populi aut eorum quibus populus potestatem dedit aliquid derogare.*'

⁴ Cicero in his definition was attempting to generalize from actual experience; there never was a precise legal definition of the idea. Cf. Kübler, loc. cit., col. 548; though why he refers to *Ad Her.* and Cicero, *De Inv.* to prove that the *Lex Iulia* contained no definition of the concept

I do not understand.

⁵ The case under consideration by Cicero is that of Flaminius in 232 B.C., and the *iniuria* is physical. The concept of verbal *iniuria* had not yet developed, and hence Naevius' opponents had to resort to other means.

⁶ For Horace's loose use of *mala* instead of *famosa* see Fraenkel, loc. cit., pp. 195-6. It is rather unimaginative to suppose that Horace is referring specifically to the Twelve Tables as the source of the law under discussion; he is merely using in a joking way the particular phrase, much as we use Biblical phrases and expressions without any intention of introducing a Christian argument. The Tables had formed an important part of Roman secondary education in the near past, as Cicero testifies, *De Leg.* 2. 23. 59.

⁷ 11. 80-3.

office. If Horace is correct—and the point of the satire would be lost if he were not—then either the law was passed after the time of Catullus or it existed at that time but was not enforced. The truth is that Horace here has in mind the *Lex Cornelia de iniuriis*, which had never been removed from the statute book, but to which in the last disintegrating years of the Republic there had been little or no recourse. Habit and practice cannot be changed by decree; in a stable society conventions on such matters evolve and, public opinion being in favour of the convention, may be strengthened by the support of law. But the conditions of stable society cannot be created by law, nor could a code of behaviour which had evolved under the aristocratic régime be forcibly introduced into the Rome of the first century. Sulla's law therefore stood as long as the Dictator was there to see it enforced; and after his death, since all parties broke it, no party was prepared to use its protection. Horace, however, aware of its existence, uncertain of the attitude of some men to criticism in the new times, and probably warned to be careful, was not ready to risk the possible consequences.¹

What, then, is Augustus' contribution to the law of libel? It is generally stated that Augustus first made libel a case of *maiestas*, or that if it had been so made by Sulla, it was again made so by Augustus, Sulla's law having been repealed. This assertion rests primarily on a statement in Tacitus: 'primus Augustus cognitionem de famosis libellis specie legis eius [i.e. maiestatis] tractavit.' This, combined with statements in Dio³ and Suetonius,⁴ has led to the general idea that Augustus induced the Senate to pass a *senatus consultum* making libel a case of *maiestas* about the year A.D. 12.⁵ The case, however, is not so simple; what Tacitus says is that Augustus was the first to apply the law of treason to cases of libel, not that libel was first made treasonable under Augustus. Tacitus is speaking here in general terms, and in fact he is not consistent with what he makes Cremutius Cordus say at his trial for treason: 'sed ipse divus Iulius, ipse divus Augustus et tulere et reliquere, haud facile dixerim moderatione magis a sapientia.'⁶ Dio in the passage referred to speaks of the burning of certain libellous publications and of the punishment of certain authors; we may identify the burning with the *s.c.* referred to in Suetonius, *Calig.* 16. 1, with respect to Cassius Severus, and suppose that he was the chief writer punished. The punishment consisted of exile; it was not until A.D. 24 that he was banished to Seriphos, *interdicto igni atque aqua*. Now this was the punishment prescribed by Caesar for *maiestas*, though whether Antonius repealed it or not we cannot say.⁷ But we may readily admit that Augustus re-established it in his own *lex de maiestate*; and if that was the punishment for *maiestas*, what are we to say of the identification of these notices with a *s.c.* which prescribed *intestabilitas* as the punishment for libellous publications? We may agree that in A.D. 12 a *s.c.* ordered the burning of Severus'

¹ Horace's caution in such matters is shown in the opening stanzas of *Odes* 2. 1. ² *Ann.* 1. 72.

³ Dio 56. 27. 1. This passage speaks in general terms of action taken by Augustus against authors of libels and their works, and belongs to the year A.D. 12.

⁴ *Aug.* 55 (see below, p. 179, on this passage); *Calig.* 16. 1: 'Labieni, Cordi, Severi scripta senatus consultis abolita requiri et esse in manibus lectitarique permisit.' Cf. *Tac. Ann.* 4. 21: 'relatum et de Cassio Severo exule . . . atque illic eadem actitando recentia veteraque odia advertit, bonisque exutus, interdicto igni atque aqua, saxo Seripho consenuit.'

⁵ Mommsen, *op. cit.*, p. 800 and n. 3; Momigliano, *op. cit.*, p. 123; Kübler, *loc. cit.*, col. 551,

suggests no date. Levy, *loc. cit.*, p. 286, astonishingly identifies his self-created *s.c.*, *Dig.* 47. 10. 5. 9, with that of Paulus, *Dig.* 47. 10. 6.

⁶ *Ann.* 4. 34. 5. In *Ann.* 1. 72. 3, he says: 'nam legem maiestatis reduxerat [Tiberius], cui nomen apud veteres idem, sed alia in iudicium veniebant . . . : facta arguebantur, dicta impune erant.' This is not strictly true; Claudia, in 246 B.C., had been prosecuted for *maiestas* on account of what she said. Cf. *Suet. Tib.* 3; *Gell.* 10. 6; *Val. Max.* 8. 1. 4; Kübler, *loc. cit.*, col. 546.

⁷ *Cic. Phil.* 1. 23: 'Quid, quod obrogatur legibus Caesaris, quae iubent ei qui de vi itemque ei qui maiestatis damnatus sit aqua et igni interdici?'

works,¹ a
the notice

The p
implicati
became a
cautious
was take
penalty
felt his
could be
compara
punishm

Then
dum pos
edant.'
authors
already
tion;⁵ a
name,
purpos
onus of
any suc
good in
would i
in *Dig*
to the
make s
notes
effusio

THE

¹ M.
the bur
against
know;
in Dio
have b
strongl
victim

² Cf.
princip
maiest
col. 55
manem
magist
attack
In this
lex ma

³ It
the pa
(ident
that in
bilitas
correc
ing of

⁵ C

works,¹ and the exile of Severus, but more than that it seems difficult to extract from the notices.

The position appears to be this: Sulla's *lex de iniuriis* still stood, and with it the implication that an *iniuria* done to one holding *imperium* or *tribunicia potestas* became a case of *maiestas*. This implication Augustus made explicit, though he was cautious of exercising the power it gave him; we know of two cases in which action was taken, those of Labienus and Severus; and they both received less than the full penalty for *maiestas*. In other words, Augustus towards the end of his life, when he felt his position sufficiently strong, reminded the world that libels against himself could be treated as *maiestas*, and having given this warning, was content with a comparatively light punishment.² It was not until the reign of Tiberius that the full punishment was imposed.³

There is still the notice in Suetonius⁴ to consider: 'censuit [Augustus] cognoscendum posthac de iis qui libellos aut carmina ad infamiam cuiuspiam sub alieno nomine edant.' Augustus here moves that there should be a judicial inquiry to discover the authors of libellous writings and songs published under a false name. Sulla had already in his *lex de iniuriis* made such authors of libellous works liable to prosecution;⁵ and Augustus now moves that if such a publication appeared under a false name, the Senate should make a special investigation to discover the author, his purpose being to provide machinery whereby such authors might be discovered. The onus of action was put upon the Senate;⁶ whereas Sulla's legislation, by not prescribing any such procedure, had left the onus upon the victim. Augustus' change would be good in itself, and particularly satisfactory to himself, for he, as the chief victim, would incur the unpopularity of being a frequent inquisitor. When the *s.c.* mentioned in *Digest* 47. 5. 10 was passed we cannot say; the likelihood is that it should be dated to the earlier years of Augustus' reign, to a time, that is, before he was prepared to make such attacks on himself cases of *maiestas*,⁷ a time, however, when anonymous notes and songs were being written by the malcontents; the *s.c.* brought these effusions within the scope of the *lex Cornelia de iniuriis*.⁸

THE UNIVERSITY OF SYDNEY.

R. E. SMITH.

¹ M. Seneca, *Praef. Controv.* 10. 5, mentions the burning of books as a punishment first devised against T. Labienus; in what year we do not know; either it was before A.D. 12 or, if the notice in Dio refers to Labienus, Severus' works must have been burnt later than A.D. 12, since Seneca strongly suggests that Labienus was the only victim on that occasion.

² Cf. Tac. *Ann.* 4. 34. 3: 'sed neque haec in principem aut principis parentem, quos lex maiestatis amplectitur.' Cf. Kübler, loc. cit., col. 551. The position of Augustus, by its permanence, had created a new situation; hitherto, magistracies being annual, it was easy to avoid attacking a magistrate during his term of office. In this sense Augustus was the first to apply the *lex maiestatis* to libel.

³ It is difficult to know how those who refer the passage of Ulpian, *Dig.* 47. 10. 5. 9, to a *s.c.* (identified with that of A.D. 12) explain the fact that in the sources there is no suggestion of *intestabilitas* as the penalty; if the identification were correct, then the penalty was exile and the burning of the offending publications. ⁴ *Aug.* 55.

⁵ Cf. Ulpian, loc. cit., para. 9: 'etiamsi alterius

nomine ediderit vel sine nomine.' This would suggest that this passage was earlier than Augustus' motion, since here it is allowed to bring a case in such circumstances. But with the interpretation here given everything is clear.

⁶ Cf. Paulus, *Dig.* 47. 10. 6: 'quod senatus consultum necessarium est, cum nomen adiectum non est eius, in quem factum est: tunc ei, quia difficilis probatio est, voluit senatus publica quaestione rem vindicari.' It seems very probable that this passage is in fact referring to the motion of Augustus mentioned by Suetonius.

⁷ The fact that Augustus made *libelli* and *carmina* the subject of special investigation when produced anonymously suggests that the *s.c.* preceded this action of Augustus.

⁸ There has been no attempt in this article to consider the attitude of the law towards speeches made in law-courts. It is clear that such speeches were privileged to some degree—to what degree we do not know—and if a pleader chose to publish such a speech, he would presumably enjoy the same privilege. We may compare Parliamentary privilege and Hansard. See Robinson, op. cit., pp. 36 ff.

INDEXES

GENERAL INDEX

Adcock, F. E., the interpretation of *Res Gestae Divi Augusti*, 34. 1, 130 ff.
Aeschylus, *Agam.* 231 ff., illustrated, 94.
Anacreon, the epigrams of, on Hermae, 31 ff.
Andrewes, A., Ephoros Book I and the kings of Argos, 39 ff.
Aristophanes, two notes on the text of (*Vesp.* 1490-2; *Ach.* 1150-1), 167 f.
Barns, J., a new *Gnomologium*; with some remarks on gnomonic anthologies (II.), 1 ff. (For Part I see vol. XLIV, pp. 126 ff.)
Beattie, A. J., an early Laconian *lex sacra*, 46 ff.
Bury, R. G., Plato and History, 86 ff.
Campbell, A. Y., on the cruces of Horace, *Satires*, 2. 2, 136 ff.
Cicero's De Officiis, a twelfth-century manuscript of, 35 ff.
Clarke, M. L., the *thesis* in the Roman rhetorical schools of the Republic, 159 ff.
Dale, A. M., metrical units of Greek lyric verse (II.), 20 ff., (III.), 119 ff. (For Part I see vol. XLIV, pp. 138 ff.)
Elephant tactics: Amm. Marc. 25. 1. 14; Sil. 9. 581-3; Lucr. 2. 537-9, 153 ff.
Ephoros Book I and the kings of Argos, 39 ff.
Fuks, A., note on the *Nova Hellenicorum Oxyrhynchiorum Fragmenta*, 155.
Gnomologium, a new; with some remarks on gnomonic anthologies (II.), 1 ff. (For Part I see vol. XLIV, pp. 126 ff.)
Gow, A. S. F., Nicandrea, with reference to Liddell and Scott, ed. 9, 95 ff.
Greek lyric verse, metrical units of (II.), 20 ff., (III.), 119 ff. (For Part I see vol. XLIV, pp. 138 ff.)
Horace, Satires, 2. 2, the cruces of, 136 ff.
Hudson-Williams, H. Ll., political speeches in Athens, 68 ff.
Laconian lex sacra, an early, 46 ff.
Libel, law of, at Rome, 169 ff.

Maas, P., Aeschylus, *Agam.* 231 ff., illustrated, 94.
Martin, R. H., a twelfth-century manuscript of Cicero's *De Officiis*, 35 ff.
Meurig Davies, E. L. B., elephant tactics: Amm. Marc. 25. 1. 14; Sil. 9. 581-3; Lucr. 2. 537-9, 153 ff.
Nicandrea, with reference to Liddell and Scott, ed. 9, 95 ff.
Nova Hellenicorum Oxyrhynchiorum Fragmenta, note on, 155.
Palmer, J. A. B., *Periplus Maris Erythraei*: ἐμπόριον νόμμου and other expressions, 156 ff.
Pearson, L., notes on two passages of Strabo, 80 ff.
Periplus Maris Erythraei: ἐμπόριον νόμμου and other expressions, 156 ff.
Platnauer, M., two notes on the text of Aristophanes (*Vesp.* 1490-2; *Ach.* 1150-1), 167 f.
Plato and History, 86 ff.
Plato's use of quotations and other illustrative material, 59 ff.
Political speeches in Athens, 68 ff.
Polyclitus and Pythagoreanism, 147 ff.
Propertius—interpretations (II.), 74 ff. (For Part I see vol. XLIII, pp. 118 ff.)
Raven, J. E., Polyclitus and Pythagoreanism, 147 ff.
Res Gestae Divi Augusti, 34. 1, the interpretation of, 130 ff.
Smith, R. E., the law of libel at Rome, 169 ff.
Smyth, W. R., *Interpretationes Propertianae* (II.), 74 ff. (For Part I see vol. XLIII, pp. 118 ff.)
Statius, the local ablative in, 143 ff.
Strabo, notes on two passages of, 80 ff.
Tarrant, Dorothy, Plato's use of quotations and other illustrative material, 59 ff.
Thesis, the, in the Roman rhetorical schools of the Republic, 159 ff.
Trypanis, C. A., the epigrams of Anacreon on Hermae, 31 ff.
Williams, R. D., the local ablative in Statius, 143 ff.

INDEX LOCORUM

Aeschines:
 3 (135), 19.
Aeschylus:
Agam. (231-6), 94.
Pers. (802), 64.
P.V. (128), 32.
Suppl. (401), 44.
Aetius:
 2 (6. 5), 147.
 5 (30. 1), 150.
Alcaeus:
 fr. (D³): (14), 125; (15), 126; (34), 125; (43), 126; (54), 127; (63), 126; (93), 125; (99), 126.
Alcidamas:
De Soph. (13), 71; (33), 73.
Alciphron:
 1 (15), 76.
Alexander of Aphrodisias:
In Met. 827 (9), 147-8.
Ammianus Marcellinus:
 15 (8. 15), 153.
 16 (5. 5), (10. 6), (10. 7), (10. 8), 153.
 18 (8. 4), 153.
 19 (1. 2), (2. 2), 153.
 20 (4. 22), (7. 2), 153.
 21 (1. 4), 153.

23 (6. 48), 153.
 24 (7. 8), 153.
 25 (1. 1), (1. 14), 153.
 26 (6. 11), 153.
 28 (4. 8), (5. 3), 153.
 29 (5. 15), 153.
 30 (3. 5), 153.
 31 (10. 9), (10. 14), 153.
Anthologia Palatina:
 5 (169), 75.
 6 (138), 33.
Antiphanes:
 fr. 209 (Kock), 168.
Appian:
Prooem. (10), 76.
 8 (7. 43), 154.
Arethaeus:
S.A. 26 (K), 107.
Aristophanes:
Ach. (1150-1), 166-7.
Nub. (542), 168.
Vesp. (1490-2), 166.
Aristotle:
Met. 2 (1. 10), 82; 986 (a 8), 151; 1036 (b 12), 147; 1090 (b 5), 148; 1092 (b 8), 147.
Physiogn. 807 (b 9), 78.
Pol. 1310 (b), 41.

Athenaeus:
 2 (70), 28;
 5 (204), 28;
Bacchylides:
 'Hthoe', 28;
 fr. (1), 28;
Cicero:
Ad F., 79.
Brut., 79.
Cat., 2.
De Fin., 2.
De In., 2.
De Or., 2.
De Ro., 2.
Orator., 2.
Phil., 2.
Tusc., 2.
Columella:
 3 (2), 2.
Corinna:
 fr., 1.
Cornelius:
Attic., 1.
Cratinus:
 fr. (1), 2.
De Bello:
 72 (4), 2.
Diodorus:
 7, fr., 2.
Diogenes:
 6 (31), 2.
 9 (53), 2.
Dionysius:
De Bo., 2.
Dioscorides:
 2 (18), 2.
 4 (27), 2.
Euripides:
Hipp., 2.
Florus:
 1 (24), 2.
Frontinus:
Aqu., 2.
Galen:
De P., 2.
Gellius:
 3 (3), 2.
Hesiod:
Op., 2.
Theop., 2.
Homer:
Il., 1.
 63, 2.
Od., 2.
 60, 2.
Horace:
Epod., 2.
Sat., 2.
Ibycus:
 fr. 6, 2.
Isocrates:
Ad N., 2.
Ad F., 2.
Cont., 2.
De P., 2.
Pana., 2.
Josephus:
A.I., 2.

Athenaeus:

- 2 (70 a), 82.
5 (204 d), (207 c), (e), 76.

Bacchylides:

- Hithos* (Snell): (16), 26; (17), 24; (18), 25, 26,
28; (90), 24; (102), 25.
fr. (1), 120; (19), 120-1.

Cicero:

- Ad Fam.* 1 (8. 4), 130; 3 (11. 2), 176; 15 (21. 4),
79.
Brut. (32), 6; (44), 70.
Cat. 2 (9. 19), 130.
De Fin. 5 (30), 143.
De Inv. 2 (17. 53), 176, 177.
De Or. 2 (78), 164; 3 (107), 163, 166; (110), 62.
De Rep. 4 (11), 169.
Orator 2 (59. 242), 74.
Phil. 1 (23), 178.
Tusc. 2 (9), 162.

Columella:

- 3 (2), 79.

Corinna:

- fr., 123-4.

Cornelius Nepos:

- Atticus* 9 (6), 130.

Cratinus:

- fr. (*Kock*): (2), (307), 7.

De Bello Africo:

- 72 (4), 153.

Diodorus:

- 7, fr. 12 (8), 41; 13 (2), 40.

Diogenes Laertius:

- 6 (31), 8.

- 9 (53), 14.

Dionysius of Byzantium:

- De Bosp. Nav.* (13), 155.

Dioscorides:

- 2 (18), 101.

- 4 (27), 114.

Euripides:

- Hipp.* (612), 64.

Florus:

- 1 (24. 16), 153.

Frontinus:

- Aqu.* (10), 79.

Galen:

- De Plac. Hipp.* (4), 149-50; (314), 10.

Gellius:

- 3 (3. 15), 170.

Hesiod:

- Op.* (287), 61; (369), 63.

- Theog.* (675), 64.

Homer:

- Il.* 1 (251), 69; 6 (235), 63; 16 (113), 62; (304),
63; 17 (32), 63; 22 (126), 64; 24 (528), 62.

- Od.* 2 (2), 115; 4 (271), 63; 5 (193), 62, 64; 11
(601), 63; (634-5), 62; 17 (218), 59; 20 (17-18),
60-61.

Horace:

- Epod.* 17 (21), 74.

- Sat.* 1 (1. 30-2), 139; (2. 115-16), 142; (4. 124),
(134-5), 137; (6. 123), 99.

- 2 (1), 177-8; 2 (1-4), 136-7; (23-35), 137-8,
140; (31-46), 140-2; (89-93), 138; (123),
142.

Ibycus:

- fr. 6 (D), 122.

Isocrates:

- Ad Nic.* 2 (22), 156.

- Ad Phil.* (29), 68.

- Contra Soph.* (16), 73.

- De Pace* (9), 71.

- Panath.* (29), 71; (178), 41; (271), 71.

Josephus:

- A.I.* 12 (372), 154.

Juvenal:

- 1 (140-1), 141.

- 11 (134-5), 141.

Lucan:

- 1 (205-10), 153.

Lucian:

- Alex.* 39 (245), 75.

- Dips.* (3), 108.

- Nav.* (15), 76.

Lucretius:

- 2 (11-13), 130; (537-9), 154.

- 3 (10-12), 11; (1034-5), 77.

Manilius:

- 3 (115), 79.

Martianus Capella:

- 7 (725. 10), 145.

Maximus Tyrius:

- 33 (8), 7.

Nicander:

- Al.* (7), 106; (55-6), 115; (89), 105; (91), 100;
(112), 97; (119), 107; (144-5), 115; (162),
(180), 100; (187), 109; (197), 115; (215), 101;
(239-40), 115; (341), 99; (415-23), 115-16;
(452-5), 116; (468), 99; (471), 101; (505), 106;
(528), 103; (529), 98; (616-18), 117.

- Th.* (26), 98; (29), 110; (66), 98; (103), 110;
(141), 105; (164-5), 112; (219), 107; (264-70),
113; (294-6), 105, 113; (322), 101; (367-8),
114; (418-19), 115; (465), 108; (479), 98;
(529), 115; (618-19), (640-2), 114; (647), 103;
(650), 105; (709), 115; (811), (815), 96; (849),
95; (869), 106; (910), 103.

- fr. 70 (1-2), 107; 74 (20-3), (40-2), 117; 85
(6), 106.

Ovid:

- A.A.* 2 (459-64), 79.

- Am.* 1 (4. 48), 75; (14. 2), 74.

- Fast.* 4 (821), 143.

- Her.* 19 (6), 74.

- Met.* 1 (484), 2 (665), 74; 3 (643), 145; 5 (380), 79.

Pap. Oxy.:

- (414), 9.

Paulus:

- ap. Dig.* 47 (10. 6), 179.

Pausanias:

- 2 (19. 2), 39.

- 3 (1. 3), 49; (13. 1), 50.

- 7 (18. 5), 49.

Periplus M. E.:

- (19), 156; (23), 157; (25), 156.

Petronius:

- (22), 74.

- (47), 79.

- (105), 77.

- (109), 79.

- (134), 78-9.

- fr. 47. 7 (Buecheler), 74.

Philodemus:

- Rhet.* 2, col. xliii (Sudhaus), 10.

Philolaus:

- fr. 11 (*ap. Stob. Ecl.* 1. 1. 3), 151.

- 12 (*ap. Stob. Ecl.* 1. 1. 3), 147.

Pindar:

- Nem.* 3 (46), 23; 7 (70), 8 (39), 27; 10 (79), 11
(5), 21.

- Ol.* 1 (1-11, 23-9), 22, 24; 2 (1-7, 17-22), 29;
7 (14-15), 21; 9 (21-8), 26; 13 (1-8), 21; 14
(7), 28.

- Paeon* 6 (117), 28.

- Pyth.* 4 (115), 64; 5 (11-11), 27; (19), 23; (23-32),
27; 8 (8-14), 25; 9 (2), 21; 10 (1-6, 13-18)
24.

Plato:

- Ap.* 20 (e), 63; 22 (a), 66; 34 (d), 63.

- Charm.* 157 (e), 32.

- Crat.* 411 (a), 413 (a), 66; 415 (a), 428 (d), 63.
Crito 44 (b), 60.
Euthyd. 285 (c-d), 66; 288 (b-c), 65; 291 (b), 66; 293 (c), 63; 297 (b), 299 (c), 65; 304 (b), 61.
Euthyph. 11 (b-c), (d-e), 66; 15 (d), 65.
Gorg. 449 (a), 63; 465 (d), 65.
Ion 541 (e), 65.
Lach. 196 (d-e), 66.
Leg. 687 (e), 66; 716 (c), 65; 906 (e), 62; 919 (b), 65.
Lys. 211 (e), 66.
Men. 90 (a), 66.
Meno 76 (d), 63; 97 (d), 66.
Phaedo 72 (b-c), 65, 66; 84 (a), 89 (c), 65; 91 (c), 61; 95 (b), 63; 99 (c), 101 (e), 65; 117 (a), 63.
Phaedr. 227 (b), 61, 64; 236 (d), 64; 259 (a), 65; 261 (b), 69; 264 (a), 64; 266 (b), 62, 64; 272 (d), 66; 275 (b), 64.
Phil. 22 (a), 66 (a), (c), 64.
Polit. 289 (b), 297 (e), 64.
Prot. 315 (b), 63; (c), 62, 63; 316 (b), 65; 338 (e), 4.
Rep. 336 (d), 66; 379 (d), 62; 388 (a-b), 61-2; 408 (b), 66; 411 (b), 64; 426 (e), 65; 493 (d), 65; 498 (a), 64; 544 (d), 64; 545 (d-e), 62, 64; 560 (c), 65; 565 (d-e), 66; 566 (c), 64; 590 (a), 65; 607 (e), 64.
Soph. 216 (c), 238 (a), 64; 246 (a), 62, 64; 268 (d), 64.
Symp. 174 (d), 177 (a), 196 (e), 63; 198 (c), 199 (a), 62, 63; 214 (b), 63; 216 (a), 65; 217 (e), 66; 219 (a), 62, 63; (d), 65; 220 (c), 221 (c), 222 (b), 63.
Theaet. 154 (d), 62, 64; 170 (e), 172 (e), 173 (e), 176 (d), 183 (e), 64; 184 (d), 65; 191 (a), 64; 195 (c), 65; 200 (e), 66.
- Plautus:**
Epid. (651), 75.
Mil. (962-3), 78.
- Pliny:**
N.H. 6 (20. 67), (20. 68), 155.
 8 (5. 12), (21. 56), 153.
 11 (114), 78.
 28 (17), 169.
- Plutarch:**
Dem. 8 (4), 73.
Lycurg. 6 (2), 48.
Mor. 89 (e), 40.
Peric. 8 (4), 69, 70.
Quaest. Conv. 7 (4. 6), 141.
- Polyaenus:**
 8 (23. 5), 153.
- Polybius:**
 4 (33. 5), 43.
 12 (25. 5), 161.
- Pomponius Mela:**
 3 (3), 139.
- Propertius:**
 1 (4. 11-14), (11. 6), 74; (13. 18), 75; (17. 4), 144.
 2 (15. 3), 75.
 3 (7. 47-50), 75; (7. 51-6), 77; (7. 59-60), 78.
 4 (4. 59), 79; (8. 10), 144; (8. 88), 78.
- Quintilian:**
 1 (9), 11; (12), 13.
 2 (1), 12, 160; (4), 160; (12), 12.
 3 (1), 70.
 5 (10), 177.
- Res Gestae Divi Augusti:**
 (25), 131; (34), 130.
- Rhet. ad Herennium:**
 1 (14. 24), 171.
 4 (25. 35), 171.
- Rhianus:**
 fr. (54), 98.
- Sallust:**
Iug. 3 (3), 74.
- Sappho:**
 fr. (D. 7): (57), 126; (85), 127; (88), 125; (90), 126; (96-8), 128; (106), (107), 126; (114), 127; (121), (124), (126), 126; (135-6), 124; (137), 125; (148), 126; (154), 127.
- [Pseudo-Sappho]:**
 fr. (93), 126; (94), 125.
- Seneca the Elder:**
Contr. 1 (praef. 12), 159.
- Seneca the Younger:**
Ep. (47), 79; (83), 15.
- Sextus Empiricus:**
Adv. Gramm. 13 (270), 9.
Adv. Math. 10 (263), 148; (279-80), 147.
- Silius:**
 9 (581-3), 154.
- Simonides:**
 fr. (5), 119; (6), 121; (30), (32), 120; (48), 119.
- Sophocles:**
Aias (386), (1146), 64.
Ant. (1105), 64.
- Speusippus:**
Theol. Arit. 82. 10 (de Falco), 147, 151.
- Statius:**
Ach. 1 (43); 144; (329), 145.
 2 (16), 143; (61), 145; (154), (337), 79.
Silv. 1 (2. 109), 144.
 2 (1. 101-2), 146.
Th. 1 (406), 143; (532), 145.
 2 (580-1), (624), 143.
 5 (387), 144.
 7 (427), 145.
 9 (535), (872), 144.
 11 (62), 145; (542), 143; (639), 144.
- Stobaeus:**
Photian Summary (2-3), 16.
- Strabo:**
 11 (7. 4), 80.
 15 (3. 9), 84.
- Suetonius:**
Aug. (55), 174, 179.
Caes. (46), 79.
Calig. 16 (1), 178.
Jul. 80 (2), 174.
Rhet. 1 (5), 164.
Vit. 14 (4), 174.
- Sulpicius Victor:**
 (3), 12-13.
- Tacitus:**
Ann. 1 (72), 178.
 4 (21), (34), 178, 179.
Germ. (23), 139; (43), 154.
Hist. 3 (68), 79.
- Theo Smyrnaeus:**
 97. 13 (Hiller), 147.
- Theocritus:**
 17 (77), 102.
Epigr. 18 (9), 18.
- Theognis:**
 (1124), 115.
- Theophrastus:**
H.P. 1 (13. 2), 100.
Met. 2 (Usener), 147.
- Thucydides:**
 1 (22. 1), 73.
- Ulpian:**
ap. Dig. 28 (1. 18. 1), 174.
 47 (10. 5. 8 ff.), 173-4, 179; (10. 15. 25), 171.
- Valerius Flaccus:**
 1 (590), 144.
- Virgil:**
Aen. 4 (373), 143.
- Vitruvius:**
 3 1. 2-7, 151.

5; (90),
; (114),
, 124;

, 119.

, 79.

o. 15. 25);

The c
main
upon
nation
ing;
(d) to

Me
annu
of the
Classi
Quart
be gu
Greece

Cop
years
Street
for 19
Cardi
per vo

Ap
Mr. J
shoul
L. J.
Bec S
Distri
Cardi
Mano
Oxfon
Swan

The Classical Association

The objects of the Classical Association are to promote the development and maintain the well-being of classical studies, and in particular (a) to impress upon public opinion the claim of such studies to an eminent place in the national scheme of education; (b) to improve the practice of classical teaching; (c) to encourage investigation and call attention to new discoveries; (d) to create opportunities for intercourse among lovers of classical learning.

Membership of the Association is open to men and women alike. The annual subscription is 5s. (life composition, £5. 5s.). Members receive a copy of the annual *Proceedings* of the Association. They may also obtain the *Classical Review* and *Classical Quarterly* at reduced prices (*Review* 13s. 6d., *Quarterly* 15s.; combined subscription £1. 5s. 6d.), though the reduction cannot be guaranteed unless the subscription is paid before January 31st in each year. *Greece and Rome* may be obtained for an annual subscription of 10s. 6d.

Copies of the final issue of *The Year's Work in Classical Studies* (covering the years 1945-7) can still be obtained from Messrs. J. W. Arrowsmith, Quay Street, Bristol, for 10s. (for members of the Association, 6s.), and the volume for 1939-45 for 6s. from Professor L. J. D. Richardson, University College, Cardiff, who can also supply most of the pre-war back numbers at 2s. 6d. per volume, post free.

Applications for membership should be addressed to the Hon. Treasurer, Mr. J. S. Shields, Queen Mary's School, Basingstoke, Hants. Inquiries should be sent to either of the Hon. Secretaries of the Association (Professor L. J. D. Richardson, University College, Cardiff, and Mr. T. W. Melliush, Bec School, London, S.W. 17) or to the Hon. Secretary of any one of the District Branches—viz. Aberystwyth, Bedfordshire, Birmingham, Bristol, Cardiff, East Anglia, Hull, Kent, Leeds, Leicester, Liverpool, London, Manchester, Northumberland and Durham, North Wales, Nottingham, Oxford, Reading, Sheffield, Shrewsbury, Southampton, South-Western, Swansea, Taunton and West Somerset.

PRINTED IN
GREAT BRITAIN
AT THE
UNIVERSITY PRESS
OXFORD
BY
CHARLES BATEY
PRINTER
TO THE
UNIVERSITY

